REYNOLDS HISTORICAL
GENEALOGY COLLECTION

ALLEN COUNTY PUBLIC LIBRARY
3 1833 01735 9875

GENEALOGY
929.102
M56MMB
1855

Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2013

http://archive.org/details/methodistquarter3747meth

Opdyke
4 vols 1137

METHODIST

QUARTERLY REVIEW.

1855.

37
4 Series
7
1855

VOLUME XXXVII.—FOURTH SERIES, VOLUME VII.

J. M'CLINTOCK, EDITOR.

New-York:
PUBLISHED BY CARLTON & PHILLIPS,
200 MULBERRY-STREET.
1855.

160183

X 765193

CONTENTS OF VOLUME XXXVII.—1855.

JANUARY NUMBER.

ARTICLE PAGE

I. A NEW TRANSLATION AND EXPOSITION OF MALACHI . 9

By the Rev. T. V. Moore, D. D., Richmond, Va.

II. MR. MAURICE AND HIS WRITINGS 26

1. Grounds for laying before the Council of King's College, London, Certain Statements contained in a Recent Publication, entitled, "Theological Essays, by the Rev. F. D. Maurice, M. A., Professor of Divinity in King's College." By R. W. Jelf, D. D., Principal of the College, and Canon of Christ Church.

2. The Word "Eternal," and the Punishment of the Wicked: a Letter to the Rev. Dr. Jelf, Canon of Christ Church, and Principal of King's College. By Frederick Denison Maurice, M. A., Chaplain of Lincoln's Inn.

3. Theological Essays. By Frederick Denison Maurice, M. A., Chaplain of Lincoln's Inn. Second Edition. With a New Preface, and other Additions.

4. Examination of Mr. Maurice's Theological Essays. By Robert S. Candlish, D. D.

III. THE PRINCIPLE OF SOVEREIGNTY 41

Histoire de la Souveraineté, ou Tableau des Institutions et des Doctrines Politiques Comparées. Par Alfred Sudre.

IV. THE ROMAN CATHOLIC PRESS IN AMERICA 72

V. THE RELATION OF BAPTIZED INFANTS TO THE CHURCH 90

By the Rev. T. F. R. Mercein, New-York.

VI. METHODISM IN AUSTRALIA AND POLYNESIA 111

Journal of a Deputation from the Wesleyan Conference to Australia and Polynesia, including Notices of a Visit to the Gold Fields. By the Rev. Robert Young.

VII. SHORT REVIEWS AND NOTICES OF BOOKS 132

1. Harper's New Gazetteer, p. 132.—2. Odenheimer's Jerusalem, p. 132.—3. The Nemesis of Power, p. 132.—4. Custine's Russia, p. 132.—5. Lamartine's Sketches, p. 133.—6. The City Side, p. 134.—7. West's St. Peter, p. 134.—8. Cumming's Bible Evidence, p. 134.—9. Duncan's Seasons, p. 134.—10. Cousin's Madame de Longueville, p. 134.—11. Hale's Kanzas and Nebraska, p. 135.—12. Coming's on Health, p. 135.—13. Perthes's Chrysostom, p. 135.—14. New Sunday-School Books, p. 136.—15. Stevens on the Parables, p. 136.—16. Trench's Synonymes of the New Testament, p. 136.—17. Katharine Ashton, p. 136.—18. Pearson on Infidelity, p. 137.—19. Jeanie Morrison, p. 137.—20. Cochran's Emigrants, p. 137.—21. Seven Wonders of the World, p. 137.—22. Baskerville's Poetry of Germany, p. 137.—23. Fry on Fish-

ARTICLE PAGE

Breeding, p. 138.—24. Hall's Queens of England, p. 138.—25. Burns's Sermons, p. 138.—26. Giles's Christian Records, p. 138.—27. Baldwin's Party Leaders, p. 139.—28. Jay's Autobiography, p. 139.—29. Willson's Outlines of History, p. 140.—30. Bowen's Stewart's Philosophy, p. 140. —31. Curtis on the American Constitution, p. 140.—32. Nairne's Paley, p. 141.—33. Pictorial Catechism, p. 141.—34. Jay's Exercises, p. 141.— 35. Scholar's Companion, p. 142.—36. Baylee on Verbal Inspiration, p. 142.—37. Wood's Natural History, p. 142.—38. Beamish on Antichrist, p. 142.—39. Waring's Agriculture, p. 143.—40. Quackenbos's Composition and Rhetoric, p. 143.—41. Mary Dundas, p. 143.—42. Maxims of Washington, p. 143.—43. Tender Grass, p. 144.—44. Mercein on Natural Goodness, p. 144.—45. Johnson's Herodotus, p. 144.—46. Harper's Magazine, p. 145.—47. Goerres's Works, p. 146.—48. Stockton's Sermons, p. 147.—49. Hudson's Shakspeare, p. 147.—50. Pictorial Gatherings for the Young, p. 147.—51. Perkins's Geometry, Trigonometry, and Mensuration, p. 147.—52. Sawyer's Organic Christianity, p. 148.—53. Wayland's Philosophy, p. 148.—54. Hall's Land of the Forum and the Vatican, p. 148.—55. Bushman's Physiology, p. 148.— 56. Pamphlets, etc., p. 149.

VIII. LETTERS ON RECENT FRENCH LITERATURE. 150

LETTER IV.

IX. RELIGIOUS AND LITERARY INTELLIGENCE 162

THEOLOGICAL AND RELIGIOUS 162

CLASSICAL AND MISCELLANEOUS 166

APRIL NUMBER.

I. A NEW TRANSLATION AND EXPOSITION OF MALACHI . 169

By the Rev. T. V. Moore, D. D., Richmond, Va.

II. CURTIS'S HISTORY OF THE CONSTITUTION 187

History of the Origin, Formation, and Adoption of the Constitution of the United States, with Notices of its Principal Framers. By GEORGE TICKNOR CURTIS. In two vols. Vol. I.

III. MR. MAURICE AND HIS WRITINGS 201

[SECOND PAPER.]

1. Theological Essays. By FREDERICK DENISON MAURICE, M. A., Chaplain of Lincoln's Inn. Second Edition. With a new Preface, and other Additions.

2. The Unity of the New Testament: a Synopsis of the First Three Gospels, and of the Epistles of St. James, St. Jude, St. Peter, and St. Paul. By FREDERICK DENISON MAURICE, M. A., Chaplain of Lincoln's Inn.

3. Examination of Mr. Maurice's Theological Essays. By ROBERT S. CANDLISH, D. D.

IV. WILLIAM JAY 229

By the Rev. Daniel Curry, D. D., President of Indiana Asbury University.

The Autobiography of the Rev. William Jay; with Reminiscences of some distinguished Contemporaries, Selections from his Correspondence, and Literary Remains. Edited by GEORGE REDFORD, D.D., LL.D., and JOHN ANGELL JAMES.

ARTICLE PAGE

V. LIBERAL AND EVANGELICAL CHRISTIANITY 246

By the Rev. Andrew A. Lipscomb, Montgomery, Alabama.

Natural Goodness: or, Honour to whom Honour is due. Suggestions toward an Appreciative View of Moral Men, the Philosophy of the Present System of Morality, and the Relation of Natural Virtue to Religion. By the Rev. T. F. Randolph Mercein, M. A.

VI. THE DOGMA OF THE IMMACULATE CONCEPTION 275

By Rev. H. B. Smith, Professor in the Union Theological Seminary, N. Y.

1. "Letters Apostolic of our Most Holy Lord, Pius IX., by Divine Providence Pope, concerning the Dogmatic Definition of the Immaculate Conception of the Mother of God," given at Rome the sixth of the Ides of December, 1854.
2. J. Perrone: De Immaculato B. V. Mariae conceptu, etc. [Can the Immaculate Conception of the Blessed Virgin Mary be defined by a Dogmatic Decree? A Theological Disquisition, by John Perrone, of the Society of Jesus, Professor of Theology in the Roman College.]
3. Joannis Launoii, Constantiensis, Parisiensis Theologi, Opera Omnia, ad selectum ordinem revocata. III. Tom. fol. Colon, 1731. [Tomi Primi Pars Prima, pp. 9–44: Praescriptiones de Conceptu B. Mariae Virginis, 1676: with the motto, from Bernard, "Virgo Regia falso non eget honore."]
4. Versuch einer Geschichte des Marien-und-Annen-Cultus in der Katholischen Kirche, von Cl. Frantz.
5. Legends of the Madonna, as represented in the Fine Arts. Forming the Third Series of Sacred and Legendary Art. By Mrs. Jameson.

VII. THE COERCIVE POWER CLAIMED BY THE CHURCH OF ROME 312

VIII. SHORT REVIEWS AND NOTICES OF BOOKS 319

1. Elliott's History of the Great Secession from the Methodist Episcopal Church in 1845, p. 319.—2. Koeppen's World in the Middle Ages, p. 320.—3. Life of St. Alphonsus Maria de Liguori, p. 321.—4. Footsteps of St. Paul, p. 321.—5. Denison's Review of Unitarian Views, p. 321.—6. Prayer for Colleges, by Tyler, p. 322.—7. Carson's Treatises, p. 322.—8. Wallace's Art, Scenery, and Philosophy in Europe, p. 322.—9. Squier's Problem solved, p. 323.—10. Thornwell's Discourses on Truth, p. 323.—11. Emma Tatham's Dream of Pythagoras, and Other Poems, p. 323.—12. Andrews's Discoveries in Chinese, p. 324.—13. Johnson's Meaning of Words, p. 324.—14. Newcomb's Cyclopædia of Missions, p. 324.—15. Bickersteth's Condensed Notes on Scripture, p. 325.—16. Porter's Chart of Life, p. 325.—17. Ewbank's World a Workshop, p. 325.—18. Doctrines and Discipline of the Methodist Episcopal Church, South, p. 325.—19. Jeter's Campbellism examined, p. 326.—20. Gilfillan's Third Gallery of Portraits, p. 326.—21. Hague's Christianity and Statesmanship, p. 326.—22. Adams's South-side View of Slavery, p. 326.—23. Jay's Mornings with Jesus, p. 327.—24. Shakspeare's Scholar, by White, p. 327.—25. Longfellow's Poets and Poetry of Europe, p. 327.—26. Hodgson's Calvinistic Doctrine of Predestination examined and refuted, p. 327.—27. Irish Stories, p. 328.—28. Johnstone's Israel in the World, p. 328.—29. The Great Journey, p. 328.—30. Kirwan's Parish and other Pencillings, p. 328.—31. Keach's Trials of True Godliness, p. 328.—32. Archbishop Whately's Detached Thoughts and Apophthegms, p. 328.

JULY NUMBER.

ARTICLE PAGE

I. TAYLOR'S WESLEY AND METHODISM 329

By the Rev. J. H. Perry, New-York.

Wesley and Methodism. By ISAAC TAYLOR.

II. THE PLURALITY OF WORLDS 356

By the Rev. J. Leavitt, New-York.

1. The Plurality of Worlds. With an Introduction by EDWARD HITCHCOCK, D. D., of Amherst College. A new edition, to which is added a Supplementary Dialogue, in which the author's reviewers are reviewed.

2. More Worlds than One, the Creed of the Philosopher and the Hope of the Christian. By Sir DAVID BREWSTER, K. H., D. C. L.

III. LIFE AND WRITINGS OF DR. JOHN PYE SMITH 379

1. Memoirs of the Life and Writings of John Pye Smith, D. D., LL. D., F. R. S., F. G. S. By JOHN MEDWAY.

2. First Lines of Christian Theology, in the Form of a Syllabus, prepared for the Use of the Students in the Old College, Homerton. With subsequent Additions and Elucidations. By JOHN PYE SMITH, D. D., LL. D., F. R. S., F. G. S. Edited by WILLIAM FARRER, LL. B.

IV. THE RELATIONS OF ROMANISM AND PROTESTANTISM TO CIVILIZATION. 408

Les Nations Catholiques et les Nations Protestantes comparées sous le triple rapport du bien-être, des lumières et de la moralité. Par NAPOLEON ROUSSEL.

V. WERE THE TEN TRIBES OF ISRAEL EVER LOST? . . . 419

By the Rev. A. M. Osbon, New-York.

VI. ROMAN SLAVERY 441

By Professor Lindsay, Wesleyan University.

VII. HASE'S CHURCH HISTORY. 457

By the Rev. W. D. Godman, A. M., Carlisle, Pa.

A History of the Christian Church, by Dr. CHARLES HASE, Professor of Theology in the University of Jena. Translated from the seventh and much improved German edition, by CHARLES E. BLUMENTHAL, Professor of Hebrew and Modern Languages, Dickinson College, and CONWAY P. WING, Pastor of the First Presbyterian Church, Carlisle, Pa.

VIII. LETTERS ON RECENT FRENCH LITERATURE 469

LETTER V.

IX. SHORT REVIEWS AND NOTICES OF BOOKS 473

1. Harper's Story Books, p. 473.—2. Follow Jesus, p. 473.—3. The Epistle to the Hebrews compared with the Old Testament, p. 473.—4. Pridham on Hebrews, p. 473.—5. Forrester's Magazine, p. 473.—6. Green's Botany, p. 473.—7. Cornell's Geography, p. 474.—8. Ladies' Repository, p. 474.—9. Oscar, p. 474.—10. Harper's Gazetteer, p. 474.—

ARTICLE PAGE

11. Belcher's Religious Denominations, p. 474.—12. M'Ilvaine's Sermons, p. 475.—13. Weaver's Ways of Life, p. 475.—14. Rosser on Baptism, p. 475.—15. Brühl's Catholic Literature, p. 476.—16. Doddridge on Regeneration, p. 476.—17. Annual of Discovery, p. 476.—18. Smith's Mental Science, p. 476.—19. Fasquelle's Napoleon, p. 477.—20. Haven's Young Man Advised, p. 477.—21. Baxter's Saints' Rest, p. 477.—22. Maury's Physical Geography of the Sea, p. 477.—23. Teachers' Last Lesson, p. 477.—24. American Cook Book, p. 478.—25. Strickland's Queens of Scotland, p. 478.—26. Edgar's History for Boys, p. 478.—27. Family at Heatherdale, p. 478.—28. Fleetwood's History of the Bible, p. 478.—29. Foote's Christianity, p. 478.—30. Watson's Select Works, p. 478.—31. Henry's Miscellaneous Works, p. 479.—32. Tricoloured Sketches of Paris, p. 479.—33. Preces Paulinæ, p. 479.—34. Life of the Countess of Blessington, p. 479.—35. Speller's Manual, p. 479.—36. Sanders' Young Ladies' Reader, p. 479.—37. Juez, p. 479.—38. Huc's Travels in China, p. 480.—39. Rutherford on Election, p. 480.—40. Minister's Family, p. 480.—41. Loomis's Practical Astronomy, p. 480.—42. Abbott's Agnes, p. 481.—43. Foster's Chemistry, p. 481.—44. Peasant-Boy Philosopher, p. 481.—45. Bradbury's Young Shawm, p. 481.—46. Hedge's Prose Writers of Germany, p. 481.—47. Baker on Discipline, p. 481.—48. Leaves from a Family Journal, p. 482.—49. Life of Zenas Caldwell, p. 482.—50. Spencer's Sermons, p. 482.—51. Ethics of Funerals, p. 482.—52. Robertson's French Language, p. 483.—53. My Mother, p. 483.—54. The May-Flower, p. 483.—55. Rosser on Class-Meetings, p. 483.—56. Golden Reed, p. 483.—57. Lamartine's Turkey, p. 484.—58. Zschokke's Switzerland, p. 484.—59. Jamieson's Commonplace Book, p. 484.—60. Prime's Travels in Europe, p. 484.—61. Sprague's Visits to European Celebrities, p. 484.—62. Rosser on Experimental Religion, p. 485.—63. Baird's Christian Retrospect and Register, p. 485.—64. The Dead in Christ, p. 485.—65. Stowel's Model for Men of Business, p. 485.

X. RELIGIOUS AND LITERARY INTELLIGENCE 485

OCTOBER NUMBER.

I. THE FIRST CHAPTER IN THE HISTORY OF AMERICAN METHODISM 489

By the Rev. S. W. Coggeshall, Mystic, Conn.

II. GERMAN GYMNASIA AND ENGLISH PUBLIC SCHOOLS . 509

[MODIFIED FROM JAHN'S JAHRBÜCHER.]

III. NIEBUHR 530

The Life and Letters of Barthold George Niebuhr, with Essays on his Character and Influence. By the CHEVALIER BUNSEN, and PROFESSORS BRANDIS and LEOBELL. New-York: Harper & Brothers. 1852. 1 vol., 12mo.

IV. JEPHTHAH'S VOW 553

By the Rev. S. Comfort, Oneida Conference.

ARTICLE PAGE

V. THE GEOLOGY OF WORDS 566

1. Trench on the Study of Words. New-York: 12mo., pp. 236.
2. Epea Pterœnta, or the Diversions of Purley. By JOHN HORNE TOOKE.
3. Fowler on the English Language. New-York: Harper & Brothers; 8vo., pp. 675.
4. Bartlett's Dictionary of Americanisms. New-York: 8vo.
5. Richardson's English Dictionary. London: 4to.

VI. LIFE AND TIMES OF BISHOP HEDDING 589

By the Rev. Dr. Curry, Indiana Asbury University.

Life and Times of Rev. Elijah Hedding, D. D., late Senior Bishop of the Methodist Episcopal Church. By REV. D. W. CLARK, D. D. With an Introduction, by REV. BISHOP E. S. JANES. 1 vol., 8vo. New-York: Carlton & Phillips. 1855.

VII. HUC'S TRAVELS IN CHINA 614

A Journey through the Chinese Empire, by M. Huc, author of "Recollections of a Journey through Tartary and Thibet." New-York: Harper & Brothers. 2 vols., 12mo.

VIII. SHORT REVIEWS AND NOTICES OF BOOKS 625

1. Tyng's Rich Kinsman, p. 625.—2. Wilson's English Punctuation, p. 625.—3. Brisbane's Bible Defended, p. 625.—4. Bohn's Libraries, p. 625.—5. Gillespie's Land Surveying, p. 626.—6. Ryle's Rich and Poor, p. 626.—7. Philosophy of Sectarianism, p. 626.—8. Chemistry of Common Life, p. 626.—9. Uhlemann's Syriac Grammar, p. 626.—10. Mind of Jesus, p. 626.—11. Methodist Family Manual, p. 626.—12. Universe no Desert, p. 627.—13. Kirwan's Letters, p. 627.—14. Reply to Howell on Infant Baptism, p. 627.—15. Hilliard's Speeches, p. 627.—16. Memoir of Mrs. Lord, p. 627.—17. Lewis's Six Days of Creation, p. 628.—18. Williams's Support of the Ministry, p. 628.—19. Art Hints, p. 628.—20. Hebrew Missionary, p. 628.—21. M'Cormick's Visit to Sebastopol, p. 628.—22. Copland's Dictionary of Medicine, p. 629.—23. Le Curé Manqué, p. 629.—24. Parkman's Offering of Sympathy, p. 629.—25. Bowen's Virgil, p. 629.—26. The Magic Word, p. 629.—27. Mountains and Molehills, p. 629.—28. Cornell's Intermediate Geography, p. 630.—29. Will's Chemical Analysis, p. 630.—30. Papal Conspiracy exposed, p. 630.—31. Summer's edition of Watson's Apology, p. 630.—32. Wharton's Monograph on Mental Unsoundness, p. 630.—33. Champlin's Demosthenes on the Crown, p. 630.—34. Tulloch's Theism, p. 631.—35. Carsten's Trifolium, p. 631.—36. Star Papers, p. 631.—37. Jackson's Life of Rev. Robert Newton, p. 631.—38. Stevens on the Preaching for the Times, p. 632.—39. M'Elligott's American Debater, p. 632.—40. Sassnett on Progress, p. 632.—41. Memoirs of Wilberforce, p. 633.—42. Lays of Ancient Virginia, p. 633.—43. Lee's Slavery examined, p. 634.—44. Norton's Internal Evidences, p. 634.—45. Norton's Translation of the Gospels, p. 635.—46. Wurzbach's Literature of Austria, p. 635.—47. Hefele's Conciliengeschichte, p. 636.—48. Eichendorf's History of the Drama, p. 637.—49. Reischensperger on the Province of Ecclesiastical Art, p. 637.—50. Bancroft's Miscellanies, p. 638.—51. Foster's Need of the Methodist Episcopal Church with respect to her Ministry, p. 638.—52. Perry's Review of Foster's Treatise, p. 640.—53. Novum Testamentum Tetraglotton, p. 642.—54. Bungener's History of the Council of Trent, p. 642.—55. Hosmer's Christian Beneficence, p. 643.—56. Abbott's Napoleon, p. 643.—57. Memoir of Sydney Smith, p. 644.

INDEX TO VOLUME 645

THE

METHODIST QUARTERLY REVIEW.

JANUARY, 1855.

Art. I.—MALACHI.

There is something peculiarly solemn in the closing book of the Old Testament canon. The stern vigour of its reproofs, the yearning tenderness of its appeals, and the sublime sweep of its predictions, combine to give it an intrinsic interest of the profoundest character. But this interest is greatly enhanced by its position. It is the transition-link between the two great dispensations of redemption—the last note of that magnificent oratorio of revelation, whose wailings of sorrow and breathings of hope were soon to give place to that richer song, which should be not only of Moses, but also of the Lamb; and tell not only of Eden and Sinai, but also of Calvary and heaven. Hence we find sounding through it voices of the past and voices of the future—the knell of the departing and the chimes of the coming age. It is, perhaps, in part to this fact that we owe some of the abruptness that characterizes this prophecy in so unusual a degree.

The same kind of interest attaches to the personal history of the prophet. He appears before us with some of the vague mystery as well as the stern vehemence of Elijah the Tishbite; delivers his message with an indignant earnestness, reproves the Pharisaic wickedness of the present, points forward to the glorious yet dreadful future, and disappears as suddenly as he came. His very name is by no means certain. The name Malachi (*my messenger*, or *my angel*) is commonly taken as an apocopated form of the name "*messenger*," or "*angel of Jehovah*." But the only instance of such an apocope given by Gesenius (Uri for Uriah) is very doubtful, if not absolutely erroneous. The invariable suffix in such forms is יָה and not ִי; and the name would have been Malachiah, like Zechariah, and the large class of compounded names of this formation. Hence it was very anciently conjectured that this

was not the name of the prophet. The Septuagint translates בְּיַד מַלְאָכִי "*by the hand of his angel*," or "*messenger*," showing that they regarded it as not a proper name. The Targum of Jonathan adds after the word Malachi, "*who otherwise is called the scribe Ezra;*" which, with other conjectures as to his name among the Jews, identifying him with Haggai, Mordecai, &c., shows that Malachi was regarded by them as merely a name of office. Indeed Haggai is actually called by this very name, "*the messenger of Jehovah*," in Hag. i, 13. And as the precise form itself occurs in chap. iii, 1 of this prophecy, where it must be translated "*my messenger*," there seems to be a very strong probability that it was given originally, at least, as an official rather than a personal title. He was called, by eminence, "the messenger of God," partly because he was the last inspired messenger of the Old Testament, and partly because he came to announce the coming of the great Messenger of the New, chap. iii, 1. But as there is no other instance in the Old Testament in which the official title alone of the writer is prefixed to the book, it is by no means impossible that the official became a personal designation, as was afterward virtually the case with John *the Baptist*, and even the Apostle Peter.

There is less difficulty in determining the age of the prophet than in ascertaining his name or personal history. Indeed it may be regarded as absolutely settled by Vitringa, who, in his elaborate disquisition, (*Observationes Sacræ*, lib. vi, cap. vii,) comes to the conclusion that Malachi prophesied about the time of the second return of Nehemiah from the court of Persia, which was somewhere between the thirty-second year of Artaxerxes Longimanus, B. C. 432, and the year B. C. 424; for Artaxerxes died after a reign of forty-one years, and Nehemiah returned the second time to Jerusalem during his life. Neh. xiii, 6. The temple was evidently built, (chap. i, 10; iii, 1–10,) which places him after Haggai and Zechariah; a civil ruler was over the Jews, which places him before the death of Nehemiah, who was their last civil ruler; and the crimes reproved by the prophet, such as mixed marriages, neglect of tithes, &c., were precisely the abuses corrected by Nehemiah. As these abuses were actually reformed by Nehemiah, we are compelled to assign the date of the prophet as precisely coincident with the second reformation of Nehemiah, or about B. C. 424. He then sustained the same relation to Nehemiah that Haggai and Zechariah did to Joshua and Zerubbabel, or Isaiah to Hezekiah, and Jeremiah to Josiah, in the earlier history of Israel. The silence of the Book of Nehemiah is no valid objection to this view, because it does not profess to be a complete history of the times, but only a personal

narrative of the acts of the author. It is an interesting coincidence, therefore, that while this stern Hebrew was reproving the formalism and falsehoods of the people of Jerusalem, Socrates was engaged in a similar work among the mercurial masses of Athens.

The characteristics of the times of Malachi are apparent on the surface of the prophecy. Before the captivity the besetting sins of the Jews were idolatry and superstition. Afterward they were prone to the other extremes of practical atheism and Epicureanism. There were two elements then at work which afterward issued in the frigid formalism of the Pharisees, and the scoffing scepticism of the Sadducees. But the predominant element, owing to the fact that they were in the transition-state from superstition, was the Pharisaic,—a spirit of proud and bigoted self-righteousness that claimed the favour of God with insolent haughtiness, at the very moment that this favour was forfeited by unbelief and neglect of duty.

The period that clapsed between the return from Babylon under Joshua and Zerubbabel, and the mission of Nehemiah, (about a century,) was by no means prosperous. The efforts of Haggai and Zechariah were crowned with only partial success. Indeed, the prophecies of Zechariah contain manifest indications of much unbelief and obstinacy among the people, and consequent punishment from the Lord. Zech. v; x, 3; xi, 6, &c. Having neglected the commands of God, they were deprived of God's favour; and adversity, instead of softening their hearts, hardened them, and led them to accuse God instead of accusing themselves. This self-righteous spirit was at the root of all their sins, as will be seen by a careful perusal of the prophecy. It had wrought its mournful results for many years preceding the first return of Nehemiah; so that he found the people disheartened, the worship of the temple neglected, and flagrant abuses encouraged in violation of the law. These he partially reformed during his first visit; but having returned to the Persian court, and remained there an indefinite time, (Neh. xiii, 6, 7,) probably from ten to twelve years, he came back to Jerusalem, and having found that the people had relapsed into many of their former sins,—such as mixed marriages, (xiii, 23–30,) withholding of tithes, (xiii, 5,) and neglect of the Sabbath, (xiii, 15–22,) —he set himself vigorously to the work of a second reformation, that might be more permanent than the first. It was then, as we infer, that he was joined by Malachi, that the special dealings of God with his ancient Church might be finished, and the canon of Scripture closed up, until the coming of that great Messenger of the covenant, who was to open a new dispensation of the great plan of redemption.

He thus ends the great argument precisely where the evangelists take it up, so that a verse of his prophecy is made the introduction to one of the Gospels. (See Mark i, 2.)

The canonical authority of Malachi has never been called in question. It is found in all the authoritative enumerations of the canonical books, and is referred to repeatedly in the New Testament as an inspired prophecy. (See Matt. xi, 10; xvii, 12; Mark i, 2; ix, 11, 12; Luke i, 17; and Rom. ix, 13.)

The prophecy is composed of six distinct portions. Part I (c. i, 1–5) opens the charges against Israel by laying bare the root of their sin, an insensibility to the love of God, that had been so signally unfolded in their history; and shows, by reference to the history and condition of Edom, how great had been that love. Part II (c. i, 6–ii, 9) addresses the priests, reproving them for their neglect of the worship of God, and their profanation of his ordinances; threatening punishment for these sins, and predicting the calling of the Gentiles. Part III (c. ii, 10–16) rebukes the mixed marriages of the people, and their injurious treatment of the Jewish wives. Part IV (c. ii, 17–iii, 6) predicts the coming of Christ and his forerunner, and the different aspects in which he will appear from that in which he is looked for by the Jews. Part V (c. iii, 7–12) reproves their withholding of tithes. Part VI (c. iii, 13–iv, 6) describes more fully the sinful character of the people, contrasts it with the character of those who fear the Lord, and then describes the contrast in their destinies that shall take place in the dread scenes of the future.

It is our purpose, in further expounding this book, to give first a literal translation of the several sections in their order, followed by a comment, which, without going extensively into grammatical or expository details, shall yet discuss the more important verbal difficulties, and suggest the more weighty expository uses of the text, in a way that will make it useful not only to the ministry, but also to the more intelligent portion of the laity, who may have no acquaintance with the Hebrew. We have used freely all the aids within our reach, but especially C. B. Michaelis, Rosenmüller, Maurer, Hengstenberg, and those to whom they refer. Indeed, so little has been done for this prophecy in the present century, that most students are at fault in attempting to obtain suitable aids for its exposition. The ordinary English expositions are so meagre that they skim over most of the difficulties of the text, and more elaborate commentaries are beyond the reach of most readers. It is our aim in this humble effort to furnish some aid to the careful student, in the absence of better assistance from more competent

hands. If it shall assist, in the slightest degree, the student of the lively oracles, in his endeavour to understand the last note of ancient prophecy, or shall stimulate any abler hand to undertake the work in a more thorough manner, our labour will not be lost, and our wishes not be defeated.

SECTION I, CHAP. i, 1–5.

The Expostulation.

1. "A BURDEN.

The word of Jehovah to Israel by the hand of Malachi.
2. I have loved you, saith Jehovah.
And ye say, 'In what hast thou loved us?'
Was not Esau brother to Jacob? saith Jehovah.
3. And I loved Jacob; and Esau have I hated, and I made his mountains a
4. waste, and his heritage for the jackals of the wilderness. But if Edom
should say [*although*] we are overthrown, yet shall we return and build up
the ruins: thus saith Jehovah of hosts, They may build up, but I will cast
down; and [*men*] shall call them the borders of wickedness, the people
5 against which Jehovah is angry forever. And your eyes shall see, and
ye shall say, Great is Jehovah beyond the boundary of Israel."

Ver. 1 contains the heading of the book. The word מַשָּׂא we have rendered "burden," being the motto of the prophecy. It is always prefixed to prophecies of a threatening character, and seems designed to indicate the fact, that like some dark cloud, heavy with its pent-up fury, these prophecies are surcharged with the wrath of God, and hang ready to pour their dreadful contents on those against whom they are directed. Many modern commentators give the word the meaning of "declaration;" but Hengstenberg shows clearly (Zechariah ix, 1, Christology II, pp. 77–79) that its undoubted meaning is "burden," in a threatening sense.

Ver. 2, 3. There is something very touching in the opening of this message of rebuke. Addressing a self-righteous and disobedient people, we would naturally expect an outburst of indignant invective. But instead of this God speaks to them in accents of the softest tenderness,—though the reproaching tenderness of love. It is like the language of some weeping parent, who seeks to woo back a prodigal child, by recalling to his memory the love that has been lavished upon him. And it is in painful contrast with this tearful tenderness of God's love that we hear the insolent challenge of the ungrateful people, "In what hast thou loved us?" Here they lay bare the root of their sin,—insensibility to the love of God, and to their own wickedness. They had been punished, and left to adversity; but instead of referring these calamities to the love of God, chastening their sins, they considered themselves unjustly treated,

and met the tender expostulation of God with dogged insolence and hard ingratitude. Their history was crowded with proofs of God's kindness in the midst of his chastisements; but with perverse hearts they looked, not at what he had left but at what he had taken. But it is too true that, in this respect, they only acted as men act still toward God,—enjoying his mercies with thankless oblivion of the giver, until some of those mercies are removed, when he is acknowledged only by murmuring complaints.

It is an additional illustration of the patient love of God that he condescends to argue the case with them. He refers to the fact that Jacob was chosen while Esau was rejected; and that they, as the children of Jacob, were enjoying the blessings that followed this choice. Their history as a people, then, compared with the history of the children of Esau, showed wherein God loved them. "Hated" is used in a negative, not a positive sense, as in the phrase, "If any man come unto me, and *hate* not his father and mother," &c. Paul quotes this text, Romans ix, 13, in illustrating the dealings of God. The argument is very obvious. Israel complained that it had not enjoyed outward prosperity, and hence had no tokens of God's love. It is replied that Israel had been much more favourably dealt with than Esau, without any claim to such treatment, and in this respect had tokens of God's love: Israel was only straitened, Edom was laid waste. The phrase לְתַנּוֹת מִדְבָּר is somewhat doubtful. Maurer and Gesenius, following the Septuagint and the Syrian version, render it "habitations of the desert." But there seems to be no necessity for a rendering so harsh. If we suppose תַּנּוֹת to be the plural of תַּן, we have a common image of a deserted spot. See Isa. xiii, 22; xliii, 20, &c. The fact that it is a feminine form is no objection to this view, for many common nouns take both forms of the gender in the plural, (see Nordheimer's Grammar, § 556, 558.) When a city became a place for the dens of jackals, it was a complete solitude.

Ver. 4 predicts the hopelessness of Edom's desolation, in spite of all the efforts of man to the contrary. Such efforts were strenuously put forth; but at last the curse of God was stronger than man, and the lonely solitudes of Petra now remain as monuments of the fact that God's words never fail. The perpetuity of this desolation is guaranteed by the fact that the current of eastern commerce that once enriched Edom, has been diverted beyond all hope of recall into other channels. Yet when this prophecy was uttered, and for years after, Edom was a prosperous and powerful country. The prediction that it should be called "the borders of wickedness" is strikingly fulfilled by its present condition, for it is one of the most

dangerous spots in the East. It can only be visited with a strong escort. Therefore the prophecy thus far has been fulfilled.

Ver. 5 predicts that these acts of God, outside of the borders of Israel, would hereafter produce a giving of glory to him—a prediction that has been verified a thousand times in those who have gazed on the rocky solitudes of once populous and powerful Edom.

The general argument of this section is wider in its application than the circumstances that called it forth. God still addresses men with the same touching appeal, "I have loved you;" and he still meets the same hard, ungrateful response, "Wherein hast thou loved us?" Men suffer many forms of outward evil and inward grief, because of their sins; but instead of referring them to the proper cause, their own wickedness, they impiously accuse God in their hearts of being indifferent to their welfare. They refuse to look at the tokens of love strewed all along their history, and dwell in obstinate ingratitude on the evils that their own sin has entailed upon them. And yet that history is crowded with such tokens. Besides the unnumbered blessings that each one individually has received, God has passed by our elder brethren, the angels who kept not their first estate, and provided a salvation for man. Here is a token of love as high as heaven, and as broad as eternity, that may be urged like the love of God to Jacob in rejection of Esau, in proof that the love of God to man is wonderful, and past finding out. And the perpetual rejection of the sinning angels, like the perpetual desolations of Idumea, stands as an everlasting proof of the goodness and severity of God,—goodness to those who had not been doomed to such a fearful rejection; severity inscrutable and mysterious to those who have.

SECTION II, CHAP. i, 6–ii, 9.

The Sin of the Priests.

6. "A son honours a father, and a servant his master. Now if I am a
father, where is my honour? and if I am a master, where is my reverence? saith Jehovah of hosts to you, O priests! despising my name!
7. And ye reply, 'In what have we despised thy name?' Offering upon
my altar polluted bread. And ye say, 'In what have we polluted thee?'
8. In your saying, 'The table of Jehovah is contemptible.' And when ye
offer the blind in sacrifice, is not this evil? And when ye offer the lame
and the sick, is not this evil? Offer it, I pray you, to your governor; will
he be pleased with it, or accept your face, saith Jehovah of hosts?
9. "And now, I pray, supplicate the favour of God that he may be gracious
to us, [*since*] by your hand must this be done. And will he accept your
10. persons, saith Jehovah of hosts? Who is there among you that will shut
the doors, so that ye may not be kindling fire upon mine altar in vain? I
have no delight in you, saith Jehovah of hosts, nor will I receive an offer-
11. ing from your hands. For from the rising of the sun to his going down

my name shall be great among the nations, and in every place incense
shall be offered to my name, and a pure offering, for great is my name
12. among the nations, saith Jehovah of hosts. But you are profaning it in
saying that the table of Jehovah is polluted, and of its produce that the
13. food is contemptible. And ye say, [*also*,] Behold what a weariness!
And ye have snuffed at it, saith Jehovah of hosts. And ye have brought
the stolen, and the lame, and the sick, and have offered an offering. Will
14. I accept this from your hands, saith Jehovah? Cursed be the deceiver
who has a male in his flock, and offers and sacrifices a corrupt thing to the
Lord! for a great King am I, saith Jehovah of hosts, and my name is feared
among the nations.
ii, 1, 2. " And now to you is this command, O priests! If ye will not hear, and
if ye will not lay to heart to give glory to my name, saith Jehovah of
hosts, then I will send upon you a curse, and I will curse your blessings.
3. Yea I have cursed them, because ye lay not to heart [*this thing*]. Behold
I will rebuke the seed for you, and spread dung upon your faces, the
4. dung of your festal offerings, and they shall take you away in it. And
ye shall know that I have sent to you this commandment, that it might
5. be [*a confirmation of*] my covenant with Levi, saith Jehovah of hosts. My
covenant with him was [*to give to him*] life and peace, and I gave them to
him, [*and on his part to me*] reverence; and he did reverence me, and
6. feared before my name. The law of truth was in his mouth, and iniquity
was not found in his lips; in peace and uprightness he walked before me,
7. and converted many from sin. For the lips of the priest should keep
knowledge, and the law should they seek from his mouth; for he is the
8. messenger of Jehovah of hosts. But ye have departed from the way, ye
have caused many to stumble by [*your*] teaching, ye have corrupted the
9. covenant of Levi, saith Jehovah of hosts. And I also will make you contemptible and mean before all the people, according as ye have not kept
my ways, and have been partial in [*dispensing*] the law."

In this section God reproves the priests for neglecting to honour him, (ver. 6,) for offering defective sacrifices, (ver. 7–9,) and for failing to vindicate the purity of his house as they ought, (ver. 10.) He then predicts the consequent rejection of the Jewish nation, and the bringing in of a people from the heathen that would serve him better, (ver. 11,) and reproves with threats their neglect of duty, (ver. 12–ii, 3,) then contrasts them with the former priests, and threatens severe punishments, (ver. 4–9.)

Ver. 6. The priests boasted that God was a Father and a Ruler to them, and hence expected blessings from his hand. God requires that they show the sincerity of this claim by treating him as they professed to regard him.

Ver. 7, 8, develop in detail their sin, and show that they treated God as they would not dare to treat an earthly ruler, striving to put him off with the mere shreds and ekings of time, strength, and means, and then wondering that he does not reward them for such niggard mockery.

Ver. 9. The principal question in regard to this verse is whether it is serious exhortation or irony. Michaelis, (and Rosenmüller, of

course, who usually transcribes Michaelis word for word, except when he is too orthodox,) Hitzig and others, take it as a serious exhortation to repentance. The difficulties in this view are, that the whole tone of the passage is reprehensive, and not hortatory; and that the challenge, "Will he accept your persons?" identical with the phrase "accept your face," in verse 8, seems to imply that God would not listen to them, and hence an exhortation to pray to him would seem idle. We therefore prefer with Maurer to take it ironically: "Go, then, with such ragged offerings and intercede with God, since this is your duty as priests; and think you that he will accept such an insult? I tell you nay. He will fling it in your teeth with, Who hath required it at thy hand, thus to tread my courts."

Ver. 10 is taken by our English version as an accusation of a mercenary spirit in the priests: "Who is there among you that would shut the doors *for naught?*" as if they were charged with being unwilling to do the smallest service for God without reward. But the coherence of the passage with what follows requires a different interpretation. It is not an indolent mercenary spirit that is rebuked, but a want of zeal to vindicate the purity of God's house. The meaning is, "Where is there among you some Phinehas, who will rise in holy indignation and shut the doors of my house against such desecration, and prevent this smoking of useless and polluting sacrifices upon my altar? Better withhold your beggarly apology for religion than insult me, and add to your own guilt by palming it upon your conscience as an acceptable service to God." It is, therefore, a burst of indignant scorn upon such attempts to palter with God in the matter of religion. Then, as now, men sought, as for the philosopher's stone, a cheap religion—one that would insure heaven to them on the easiest terms. Hence they made a shuffling compromise with duty, compounding for the lowest possible percentage of self-denial and effort. God assures them that a cheap religion, like most cheap things, was always dear, since it always cost more than it was worth,—for it was worth just nothing. God will not despise the widow's mite, but he will despise the miser's mite,—especially when the blinded man is dreaming that by this beggarly shift he is securing the favour of God. As he drops his pittance into the treasury of the Lord, a voice comes forth from the throne, Who is there among you that will close the doors against this insulting mockery, and tell the starveling giver that he had better keep his miserable apology for a gift, for it was worse than thrown away when presented as an offering to God. O that this voice of indignant scorn could be rung through the laggard Churches

of Christendom, who are striving to solve the same impossible problem in the maxima and minima of spiritual calculus, with how little self-denial and active labour a man may reach heaven at last.

The wish that the doors of the temple should be closed, conveys an intimation that if no one is found to shut them God will do it himself; or rather will forsake that temple, and leave it an altar without a promise and a shrine without a divinity. This explains the force of "for" in the next verse.

Ver. 11 is elliptical, the exact antecedent to "for" not being expressed. The intimation is: "But if there be none who will thus vindicate the glory of my name among the priests of my own temple, still that name shall be glorified; *for* a people will be raised up from among the heathen who not merely in this temple, but 'in every place,' shall offer, not the blind and lame, but a pure offering to my name." This, then, predicts the rejection of the Jews, and the calling of the Gentiles into the Church. The conversation of Christ with the Samaritan woman, at Sychar, is a striking commentary on this verse.

And who can tell but that, if we also are faithless in God's work, others may be raised up from the dark places of heathenism, and we left to perish in our rejection? Certain it is that God's name will be glorified on the earth; and if we are false to our duty, he can of the very stones raise up children to Abraham, while we are shut out.

Ver. 12 renews the charge of sacrilege in further detail. The "produce" of the altar was the offerings of the people, from which the priests obtained their subsistence, which the priests despised, like the godless sons of Eli, perhaps longing gluttonously for more luxurious fare.

Ver. 13 amplifies the charge. The priestly function was to them a weariness, in view of its imperfect reward; and they "snuffed" at the provision that was made for them at the Lord's table. Religion is still a weariness to many, and the provisions it furnishes to the soul snuffed at with ill-disguised contempt.—אֹתוֹ, *it*, refers to the produce of the table of the Lord, in verse 12; גָּזוּל means torn away by violence—that is, stolen, and not lacerated.

Ver. 14 reproves the people, as well as the priests, for withholding suitable offerings to the temple. A male victim was more valuable than a female. It was, indeed, expressly required by the law. See Lev. i, 3, 10, &c. The same intimation of a removal of the Church to the Gentiles, if the chosen people were unfaithful, as in verse eleven, is made in the second clause. Alas! how often do we keep back the firstlings of our flocks, the best of our services, and

offer God the shreds of our time, the weary remnant of our thoughts and affections, and the niggardly gleanings of our means! It is in touching reproach that God refers to the heathen, as if he had said: The very heathen fear me more than my own people; even now in their blindness they have more dread of offending me than those whom I have chosen. Alas! heathenism in the great day will condemn much of our Christianity.

Chap. ii, 1. Having, in chap. i, 14, turned aside for a moment to the people, he returns to the priests, whom he rebukes for violating the covenant of the priesthood: (1) by unbelief and disobedience, ver. 2, 3; (2) by corrupt teaching, ver. 4–8; (3) by partiality in dispensing the law, ver. 9.

Ver. 2 threatens a curse for disobedience, if it were persisted in. The phrase וְגַם אָרוֹתִיהָ is taken by Maurer and others as an emphatic repetition; but it seems more natural to give גַם its ordinary meaning, and take the verb as a preterite. Then the sense would be: "This is no idle threat, for the curse is even now upon you because of your sin: ye are condemned already."

Ver. 3. To rebuke the seed is to forbid its growing. "For you," is for your disadvantage. (For this use of לְ see Nordheimer, § 868.) The spreading of dung on the face is an image of the most insulting indignity, while the being carried away in it is assurance that this indignity will be permanent,—a thing that cannot be fled from, but will cleave to and follow its objects wherever they go.—נָשָׂא is to be taken here impersonally.

Ver. 4 is susceptible of two interpretations. That of Rosenmüller and others makes "this commandment" to be in apposition with "the covenant with Levi," asserting their substantial identity; but this is incompatible with the words לִהְיוֹת which express design. We therefore prefer that of Maurer, which takes the last clause as explaining the design of this commandment, with its threats, namely, to establish the original covenant with Levi, and bring the priests back to the purity of their sacred order, and thus effect a complete reformation.

Ver. 5 explains more fully the covenant with Levi, alluded to in the fourth verse; and shows, by the mode in which Levi observed it, how much his descendants had violated it. The grammatical construction of מוֹרָא is somewhat doubtful. Rosenmüller and others take it as an accusative in apposition with the suffix ֶם, representing the design for which the life and peace were given. We prefer with Maurer to take it as a nominative in apposition with "covenant," just as "life and peace" are in the preceding clause, and expressing

the other branch of the covenant. The sense then would be as follows: "My covenant with Levi was this, namely, on my part there were to be given to him *life and peace*, and I fulfilled my part, and gave them to him; on his part there was to be rendered to me *reverence;* and he did reverence me, and fear before my name." This furnishes the most consistent sense, and requires no unusual grammatical construction. It states first the conditions of the covenant on both sides, and secondly the fact that these conditions had been faithfully met. This was at once a reproof to the irreverent descendants of Levi, and an explanation of the absence of those blessings from God's hand which they considered to be guaranteed to them by the covenant. The covenant referred to we have in Numbers xxv, 12, 13, "Behold I give unto him my covenant of *peace;* and he shall have it and his seed after him, even the covenant of an *everlasting* priesthood,"—life and peace.

Ver. 6 describes yet further the conduct of the ancient priesthood. The law of truth in the mouth refers to their truthful teachings, the absence of perversity in their lips to their upright judgments in judicial cases. See Deuteronomy xvii, 8, 9; xix, 17, where judicial functions are expressly recognized in the priesthood. And as the priests were especially to judge of the fitness of sacrificial offerings, the comparison becomes yet more bitter as a reproof. To walk with God is to follow his precepts, as did Enoch, (Genesis v, 22;) Noah, (vi, 9;) and Abraham, (xvii, 1.) To walk in peace is so to walk as to please God; and to walk in uprightness is to walk sincerely, without guile. The effect of this kind of walking with God then, as now, was the conversion of sinners.

Ver. 7 declares that these were the proper functions of the priesthood, and hence those in whom they were wanting were derelict to their duty.

Ver. 8 openly charges the dereliction intimated in the seventh verse. They have not only departed from the right way themselves, but have caused others to do so by their teaching. We have, with Maurer and De Wette, rendered תּוֹרָה here teaching rather than law, because it requires that sense in the preceding verses, and bears it here. Instead of converting sinners, they perverted them; instead of teaching truth they taught error; instead of keeping the Levitic covenant they broke it, and therefore forfeited all claim to the blessings it promised, exposing themselves to yet additional punishments.

Ver. 9 threatens these punishments, and declares that as they had violated the conditions of the covenant, God would inflict its penalty. As they had exercised their priestly functions, judicial and other-

wise, partially, respecting the persons of one class while they disregarded those of another, God would visit them with punishment for this injustice.

The lessons of this section have been suggested in the exposition, and need not be drawn out in detail. The grand lesson is, that men never make anything by attempting to drive a hard bargain with God. Religion is not a thing of bargain, but a thing of love; and the moment a man begins to chaffer for easier terms, he shows that his heart is not right before God. We may compromise with conscience for a low rate of obedience; but we will discover at last that God has not endorsed the compromise, and therefore it is worthless. We have lost not only what we thought we had purchased, but lost also what we paid for it. Let us, then, be warned by the example of these faithless priests, and not bring the refuse of our good things to God, as if anything were good enough for him and his service; but give him the firstlings of our powers and possessions, with the assurance that no man ever lost anything by serving God with a whole heart, or gained anything by serving him with half a one.

SECTION III, CHAP. ii, 10–16.

Mixed Marriages.

ii, 10. "Is there not one father to all of us? Has not one God created us?
Wherefore, then, do we act treacherously one toward another, [lit. *a man*
11. *toward his brother,*] in profaning the covenant of our fathers? Judah acts
treacherously, and wickedness is done in Israel and in Jerusalem; for Judah
has profaned the holiness of Jehovah, which he loved, and has married
12. the daughter of a strange god. Jehovah will cut off the man who did
this, the watcher and the answerer, from the tabernacles of Jacob, and him
13. presenting an offering to Jehovah of hosts. And this in the second
place have ye done. Ye have covered with tears the altar of Jehovah,
with weeping and crying, so that there is no seeing of your offering. or
14. accepting favourably from your hands. And ye say, Wherefore? Because
Jehovah is the witness between you and the wife of your youth,
toward whom you have acted treacherously, and she your companion
15. and the wife of your covenant. And did he not make one? And the
remainder of the Spirit was with him. And wherefore one? Seeking a
seed of God. Take heed then to your spirits, and do not act treacherously
16. to the wife of your youth. For he hates putting away, saith
Jehovah the God of Israel; and the one who covers his garment with
iniquity, saith Jehovah of hosts. Take heed then to your spirits, and do
not act treacherously."

The prophet now turns to reprove the sin of mixed marriages, which we learn from Nehemiah was one of the crying sins of the Jews at this time. The greatness of the sin arose from the fact that it tended to defeat one of the purposes of the Mosaic economy. God isolated the Jews from all other nations, that they might be a nursery for the great ideas of religion that were to be elaborated in the history of

the world, and a stock from which he would bring forth the Messiah. All mingling with other nations, who had not been trained in this way and preserved for this purpose, tended to defeat this design. Especially was this true of matrimonial alliances. Heathen women retained a natural longing for the indulgences of their own religion, and easily led their husbands into guilty compliances. The women of Moab and Philistia, and the wives of Solomon, furnish mournful proofs of this fact. They led their infatuated husbands and paramours into the grossest idolatry. Hence these connexions were grievous sins against God; but as they led to cruel treatment of the Jewish wives, they were also sins against humanity. The prophet strikes at once at the heart of the sin, and shows that it is want of fidelity to God that lies at the root of it all. Whoever violates the theocratic law, rebels against God who made it. They, therefore, who chose heathen wives, thereby rejected the God of Israel.

Ver. 10 opens somewhat abruptly. The argument is this: God has chosen us as his children, from all other nations, to preserve us a peculiar people for peculiar purposes. To intermarry with heathen defeats these purposes, and therefore is a sin against our Father God. The fatherhood here spoken of is not that of the whole human race, or the reasoning would be without force, since he was in that sense the Father of the heathen as well as of the Jewish woman. The word "create" does not militate against this view, for it is used exactly as in Isa. xliii, 1, "Thus saith the Lord that *created* thee, O Jacob," &c.

The Jewish people were a family of God, and to introduce heathen members into it, without permission from God, was to violate both the filial and the fraternal relations.

Ver. 11 specifies the crime by which this filial relation had been violated, viz., marrying the daughter of a strange god, or, in other words, the worshippers of strange gods. The filial relation is used in Scripture to express the relation between worshipper and worshipped. (See Jeremiah ii, 27, "Saying to a stock, Thou art my father," &c.)

Ver. 12 declares that however lofty or sacred be the position of the offender, he shall surely be punished. The proverbial phrase עֵר וְעֹנָה, Gesenius renders "the waking and the answering," supposing that it refers to the watch of the Levites in the temple, when one kept awake and called and the other answered. The Arabs have a similar proverbial expression, "No caller and no answerer." The meaning is, whatever or whoever he may be; being an idiomatic phrase for universality, like our English one "root and branch."

Ver. 13 turns to the human aspect of this sin, and shows the cruelty that it involved to the Jewish wives. By a bold and beautiful figure he represents the guilty husbands as covering the altars of God with the tears and cries of their injured wives, so that the offering on the altar cannot be seen by God. The mute supplication of sacrifice may rise to invoke a blessing on the offerer; but above it, and rising first to heaven, is the language of injured innocence that calls down a curse on the man who has wronged the helpless and confiding wife of his youth.

Ver. 14 opens with a query from the people, Wherefore God thus refused to receive their offerings? The answer is, Because he was a witness to the nuptial contract. Marriage is a religious act, having all the solemnity of an oath; and God is called to witness this compact, and therefore to punish any violations of its terms. This was true, in an especial sense, with the theocratic people, for reasons already suggested. The phrase "wife of your covenant" alludes to the fact that the wife was a daughter of Israel, the covenant people; and therefore a sin against her, in this respect, was a sin against God. The phrases "wife of your youth" and "companion" are thrown in to show the aggravated nature of this offence. "She whom you thus wronged was the companion of those earlier and brighter days, when in the bloom of her young beauty she left her father's house and shared your early struggles, and rejoiced in your later success; who walked arm in arm with you along the pilgrimage of life, cheering you in its trials by her gentle ministry; and now, when the bloom of her youth has faded and the friends of her youth have gone, when father and mother whom she left for you are in the grave, then you cruelly cast her off as a worn-out, worthless thing, and insult her holiest affections by putting an idolater and a heathen in her place." There is something very touching in these allusions to the aggravations of this wrong, arising from the tender associations and memories of youth.

Ver. 15 is one of some difficulty, and has been singularly misunderstood by the commentators. Most of the continental interpreters, including Rosenmüller, Maurer, and Hengstenberg, follow Kimchi, and interpret it as referring to Abraham, and stating an objection of the Jews, thus making אֶחָד a nominative. "Did not one (viz., Abraham) do so?" *i. e.*, take a heathen Hagar to wife? The prophet replies, Yes; but it was to raise up a godly seed. This interpretation is so unnatural that it is amazing that it should have been so generally adopted. It is liable to insuperable objections. First, there is no reason for supposing an allusion to Abraham here. He is never called by the name of "the one," nor was his conduct a

parallel at all to that reproved. The crime reproved here was putting away their covenant wives and taking heathen wives. But Abraham did not put Sarah away when he took Hagar; and he took her also at Sarah's request, and not, as the Jews then did, in utter disregard of the wishes of their wives. Hence the cases are wholly dissimilar. Secondly, this interpretation gives no sufficient sense to the words וּשְׁאָר רוּחַ לוֹ. The tame rendering "to him there was a remnant of intelligence" of Maurer, shows how utterly unmeaning they are on this interpretation. The idea of "remainder" cannot be made to cohere with this view of the words. The same thing is true of the idea of *one*-ness that is made so prominent. Thirdly, in every other case an objection by the people is introduced by the formula, "ye say," the omission of which here is fatal to this view. Others, with Calvin, and most of the English interpreters, refer the words to Adam and Eve. But the case of Adam and Eve does not touch the one before us. It would be pertinent if the sin reproved were polygamy, but not at all so when it is the putting away of a covenant, *i. e.*, a Jewish wife, and taking a heathen in her place. This also, like the preceding interpretation, gives no face to the *one*-ness insisted on in the verse as bearing on the question, and which furnishes the key to the passage. The cases of Adam and Abraham have nothing that meet the logical demands of the verse. The true view of the passage has been brought out by no writer we have seen except Rev. P. Fairbairn, of Salton, Scotland, in an essay in the Christian Treasury for 1847, (Edinburgh, p. 287.) And its obvious coherence demonstrates its truth at sight.

The prophet at the outset (ver. 10) had argued the oneness of the Jewish people from the fact that they had one father. They were therefore one, and these mixed marriages that violated this oneness were wrong. This wrong became more apparent when the reason for this oneness is regarded. Having then shown that the Jews were breaking this arrangement and inflicting cruel injustice on their covenant wives, he asks again, as he did at the outset, "Did not God make us one? Did he not separate us from other nations into an isolated unity? Yet this was not done because the blessing was too narrow to be spread over other nations, or because infinite fulness was exhausted; for the residue of the Spirit was with him. There remained an inexhaustible fulness of spiritual blessing that might have been given to other nations. Why then did he choose but one? It was that he might make a seed of God, a nation which he should train to be the repository of his covenant and the stock of his Messiah, a people in which the true doctrine of the unity of God should be cherished amid surrounding polytheism and

idolatry, until the fulness of time should come. Now to introduce this very polytheism and idolatry into the chosen people, and to reject the wives who were protected by the covenant, was to break up this oneness, and do that which if persisted in would amalgamate the Jewish people with the other nations of the earth." Such we consider to be the argument of the prophet; and its obvious consistency and force, its development of the significance of the words "one," "remainder," and "seed of God," that are the pregnant words of the sentence, demonstrate it on presentation to be the true view of the passage.

Ver. 16. The words כִּי־שָׂנֵא שַׁלַּח are rendered by the Septuagint, Vulgate, and Luther's translation, "if he hate her, let him put her away." But as it is a *quasi* putting away that is condemned, a permission to do so in such a connexion would seem to be incongruous. The ordinary sense of כִּי is "for," and not "if," as this view demands; and the absence of pronominal suffixes and the form of the second verb are inconsistent with this view. The form would be שָׁלַח, the Pret. Kal, instead of the Piel Inf. construct as we find it, in which conjugation it has the sense of divorcing. (See Gesenius, *s. v.*) Hence we prefer, with most modern interpreters, to take Jehovah as the subject of the first verb, and render it, "for he [Jehovah] hates [*such*] putting away," *viz.*, as has just been described. This is given as the reason for the warning to "take heed and not act treacherously to the wife of your youth." The change of persons from the third to the first is not at all uncommon. (See Zech. xiv, 2, 3.)

The words וְכִסָּה חָמָס עַל־לְבוּשׁוֹ have been variously rendered. A common rendering is, "who covers violence with his garment," *i. e.*, conceals it. The grammatical objection to this is, that עַל with this verb always designates the thing covered, and not the covering itself. (See Deut. xiii, 8; Hab. ii, 14, &c.) Hence we have rendered it, "who covers his garment with violence." The word "garment" was used among the Hebrews to designate the conjugal relation, (see Deut. xxii, 30; Ruth iii, 9; Ezek. xvi, 8,) somewhat as the word bed is with us. It is, also, so used in Arabic. Hence, to cover the garment with violence, was to act in a violent and unjust manner toward the conjugal relation, just as to be unfaithful to the bed is with us to be unfaithful to the nuptial obligations. This brings the phrase into exact harmony with the rest of the section, and makes a fitting conclusion to this solemn rebuke.

The great doctrine that underlies this section is, that God has a people in the world bound to him by special relations, and, by virtue of this fact, bound by special relations to one another. The violation

of these relations to each other is therefore a violation of their relations to him. The Christian Church is still such a people, and although its relations to the world are very different from those of the Jewish people, this law of mutual obligation is still in force. The Church is one family, and is bound to act thus in all the dealings of its members with each other. And even in the matter of marriage her members must not be unequally yoked, but have reference to their Christian obligations in forming this relation, and marry in the Lord, *i. e.*, in accordance with the obligations that bind them to the Lord. The neglect of this principle has caused incalculable wretchedness and apostasy in the past, and condemned many a heart either to life-long sorrow, by the sin of a partner in life, or, worse still, to a fellowship with that sin and its consequent condemnation.

(To be continued.)

ART. II.—MR. MAURICE AND HIS WRITINGS.

1. *Grounds for laying before the Council of King's College, London, Certain Statements contained in a Recent Publication, entitled, "Theological Essays, by the Rev. F. D. Maurice, M. A., Professor of Divinity in King's College."* By R. W. JELF, D. D., Principal of the College, and Canon of Christ Church. Oxford and London. Parker and Rivingtons. 1853.
2. *The Word "Eternal," and the Punishment of the Wicked: a Letter to the Rev. Dr. Jelf, Canon of Christ Church, and Principal of King's College.* By FREDERICK DENISON MAURICE, M. A., Chaplain of Lincoln's Inn. Cambridge, [England.] Macmillan and Co. 1853.
3. *Theological Essays.* By FREDERICK DENISON MAURICE, M. A., Chaplain of Lincoln's Inn. Second Edition. With a New Preface, and other Additions. Cambridge. Macmillan and Co. 1853.
4. *Examination of Mr. Maurice's Theological Essays.* By ROBERT S. CANDLISH, D. D. London. Nesbit and Co. 1854.

OUR readers do not need to be informed that in the bosom of the Church of England there is ever maintained a strife of parties. The different influences which, three centuries ago, combined to determine the complex form, and to fix the incoherent accessaries of English Protestantism, as by law established, have, through the circumstances of that Church's position, and, above all, through the spirit and tendencies of her established order, and her many-toned and sometimes dissonant teachings, been themselves continually reproduced and propagated afresh. That is to say, the influences which determined the form and conditions of that Church have been con-

tinually generated anew by that very form and those very conditions. There has ever been, for instance, a Sacramentarian party, approximating in doctrine to the teachings of Rome. There have indeed been periods of universal dormancy, when the principles of this party have been little more than alive; but they have never been extinct or quite forgotten. And so, on the other hand, there have never been absolutely wanting representatives of the Puritan or evangelical school, who have held by the doctrines of grace, and whose stronghold is the "articles," as that of "the other party is the sacramental services and the offices of the Church, especially as performed according to the rubric."

But besides this distinction of parties there is, and has always been, another, not indeed so marked and obvious, but scarcely less important. One school of Anglican divines has been accustomed to dwell more predominantly, sometimes almost exclusively, on the personal history and character of Christ, considered as God incarnate, and, at the same time, as "the Pattern-Man." His life in the flesh has been their theme of meditation and the inspiration of their eloquence:—his life as that of "God manifest in the flesh," and his death as crowning and consummating that humble, holy, and loving life; but not his death as the need and hope of man, as the essential fact of his history and of God's revelation, as the grand centre on which the eyes of all believing men must be fixed, and round which all the harmony of earth and heaven revolves. Another school, again, has probably fixed its attention too exclusively on the death of Christ, and the results which directly flow therefrom for the benefit of sinners, and has comparatively neglected the glorious teachings and revealings of the personal life of Christ, as the image of his Father's glory upon earth, as the perfect teacher of pure wisdom, truth, and holiness, and as the pattern and example of faultless and God-inspired humanity. The remote cause of *this* distinction of parties, also, may be traced to the formularies of the Church of England. The impulse which the Anglican Church received from the Reformation would have led it to dwell mainly upon the atoning character and virtue of the death of Christ, and the doctrines immediately connected with this grand and central truth, which were, in fact, the very life-blood of the Reformation, and which are strongly and impressively embodied in the articles and in the communion service of the Church of England. But the dominant tendency of the formularies of the Book of Common Prayer—a tendency derived from the originals, out of which these formularies were selected and prepared, and characteristic of the whole stream of post-apostolic teaching, down even beyond Augustine, and indeed till the time of

Anselm—is to dwell with marked predominance upon the personal life and character of Christ as the incarnate Son of God; so much so, that it has been calculated, by a competent and favourable critic, that "in the whole eighty-six collects for the year the doctrine of the atonement is only some two or three times explicitly expressed, and in some of these very cursorily; while on some of those occasions where *à priori* we should have most confidently expected to find it, it is certainly not present."

This second division of parties in the Church of England is made upon a different principle from the former; yet it will, of course, be seen at once that the section of divines, which, in this latter case, makes the atoning death of Christ the main theme and centre of their ministrations, must coincide substantially with the Puritan or evangelical party, according to the former division. It will not, however, follow from this that the two other parties must be identical. There is this point to be observed, that whereas the doctrines of the Sacramentarians and of the Evangelicals are essentially opposed, and can never blend, there is no such necessary opposition in the other case. It is only when the incarnation and life of Christ are so dwelt upon as to ignore or deny the atoning virtue and true sacrificial character of Christ's death that there ensues any positive opposition between the two parties in this case. It were well, indeed, if these two themes were always dwelt upon in just mutual proportion. In fact, the tendency to dwell upon the character and glory of the living Christ, as God incarnate, is capable of being combined with either Sacramentarian or Evangelical views. We have reason to know that some of the most luminous, spiritual, and instructive teaching of the higher and more thoughtful Evangelical school, in both Scotland and England, is strongly imbued with this tendency; and the best expository preaching of British Methodism has been improved and heightened, in tone and quality, by a tincture of the same. In the opposite direction, again, the able and comprehensive work of Archdeacon Wilberforce, on the Incarnation, shows how the most highly cultivated, the most thoughtful and refined masters of Sacramentarian theology can combine their semi-Popery with the contemplation of the incarnate Son of God, in his various offices and relations as toward God, and, especially, as toward man.

This characteristic tendency of theological speculation, however, though not sufficiently defined or dogmatic to be exclusive of any other school, is yet in fact sufficiently broad and obvious to have secured for itself a separate *status*, and for its leaders or (shall we say) its followers a specific designation. The adherents of this

theology are mainly those who have been, by one of themselves, described as the "Broad Church,"* in contradistinction from the "High Church" and the "Low Church," that is, the Sacramentarians and Evangelicals. The coryphæus of this school is the genial, accomplished, and erudite Archdeacon Hare, perhaps best known for his work entitled the "Mission of the Comforter." The most valuable and remarkable part of this work is contained in the "Notes," which embody a history of the Church's teaching, and of the development of doctrine upon the subject of the "work of the Spirit," from the earliest period downward, with a catena of the choicest and most valuable illustrative extracts, from divines of every age. The monster note, "W," (now published separately,) is the ablest, completest, and most eloquent vindication of Luther from the calumnies of Bossuet, and of his modern English assailants, which has been yet given to the world. Archdeacon Hare is, so far as opposition to Popery and admiration for the Reformers may make him so, a thorough Protestant. His refutation of Newman's development theory is considered to be as far superior to every other reply which that work has called forth, as his vindication of Luther is to every other defence of the great Reformer. In his notes to the "Mission of the Comforter," also, he continually quotes, with admiration and sympathy, passages of the deepest evangelical colouring from the writings of the Reformers, and of other evangelical divines; yet, strange to say, it is impossible to affirm, on the evidence of his writings, various, popular, and often diffuse as they are, (we refer especially to his Sermons,) that he is a believer in the true Protestant doctrine of the atonement,—that the death of Christ was a really expiatory and truly vicarious sacrifice for sin. He sometimes uses language which might easily convey the orthodox sense, but he nowhere explicitly avows his adherence to the Evangelical Reformed doctrine on this point; nor does he anywhere plainly announce *this* gospel to his hearers, and urge it upon the faith of their hearts. He does, indeed, distinctly enough, reject Sacramentarianism, and he teaches very distinctly, and with abundant eloquence, justification by faith. But the phases of modern theology have made it too well known that justification by faith is not always understood, by those who preach or receive it, to mean justification by faith in the atoning efficacy of Christ's sufferings and death, in the sense we have just defined.

Another acknowledged leader of this "Broad Church" school, only second to Hare in fame and influence, and in some quarters and in certain respects even more influential than the archdeacon, is, or has

---

* See the Edinburgh Review for October, 1853.

been, Professor Maurice, to whom this article is to be mainly devoted, and who is the brother-in-law of Archdeacon Hare. He is not only not orthodox in his view of the doctrine of atonement, but really seems to be widely astray upon every point of experimental theology. He believes in the doctrine of the Trinity, and in Christ as the Head and Pattern of what he speaks of as regenerated humanity,—meaning by this phrase something very different from what evangelical divines would understand by it. But with his peculiar and characteristic ideas upon this subject he incorporates many of the practical views which are common to those—of whatever tendencies in other respects—who love to dwell, in the way we have described, upon the thought of God incarnate as the Pattern-Man; and so far as those liberal and popular sympathies and tendencies are concerned which are characteristic especially of the "Broad Church," he has ever appeared as a leading spirit among those who represent them. Man, as such, is the object of his intensest sympathy; and the elevation of the race, especially of the most ignorant and helpless members of it, seems to be the passion of his life. Would that he had chosen, as his main argument and instrument in promoting this godlike object, the old-fashioned "gospel of the grace of God!"

Another name, often linked with that of Maurice in this relation, is that of Charles Kingsley, rector of Eversley, author of "Village Sermons," and supposed author of "Alton Locke," "Yeast," and other fictions of a like tendency. His sermons are very earnest and eloquent; but he preaches a wild gospel, stranger almost than Mr. Maurice's. His novels are clever and powerful; but their political economy is as one-sided as the theology of his sermons. He has appeared very conspicuously before the world as the exponent and advocate of a scheme of Christian socialism.

Professor Trench, of King's College, a friend and lately a colleague of Mr. Maurice, though very different in his genius and many of his views from either his late colleague or Mr. Kingsley, and far from holding extreme opinions, so far as we know, in any direction, is yet supposed to belong to the general school we are describing. In his various and deservedly-esteemed works, (on the "Miracles," "Parables," &c.,) he brings fully out to view what may be called the humanitarian ſide of the life of Christ: and he sympathizes, to a considerable extent, with the popular tendencies of the age. Yet he is certainly not a Low Churchman, and is examining chaplain to Samuel Wilberforce, Bishop of Oxford, (brother of the fargone archdeacon,) who, it would seem, is claimed, notwithstanding his High Churchmanship, as belonging to the Broad Church school.

Conybeare, the author of that article on Church Parties, in the Edinburgh Review, to which we have referred, and joint-author with Mr. Howson of the beautiful and complete work, entitled, "Life and Epistles of St. Paul," is certainly one of this school; as is also, we presume, his equally accomplished coadjutor and friend, Mr. Howson. We may note, in passing, that Mr. Conybeare, some time ago, in the same Review, inflicted upon the redoubtable and bigoted Bishop of Exeter a most complete and terrible, as well as richly-merited, flagellation.

The above remarks will convey to our readers some idea of the main tendency, and yet characteristic laxity and latitudinarianism, of this "Broad Church" section of the English clergy, whose "distinctive character," Mr. Conybeare says, "is the desire of comprehension," and whose "watch-words are charity and toleration." If we are asked what is to account for the recent sudden development of this vaguely-defined but yet highly-influential party, which, though still comparatively small, is said to contain a very large proportion of the liberal authorship and cultivated intelligence of the Church of England, we can only say, that it appears to be due mainly and directly to the influence first of Coleridge, and then of the late Dr. Arnold, who was a thorough English Churchman, and yet a man of most various and comprehensive cultivation, and of almost universal sympathies; and more indirectly and remotely, but still in no inconsiderable degree, to the influence of such German theologians as Schleiermacher and Neander upon Coleridge and Arnold themselves, and upon other leaders of the party. But such views are also, to a certain extent, as we have shown, indigenous to the Church of England; and if transplanted to that soil, at any period, from other regions, will always there find a congenial *habitat.* Dogmatic precision is not the characteristic of Anglican formularies. Christ lives and speaks there as God incarnate, and as the friend and pattern of humanity; but the doctrines of a present justification, a real and vital regeneration, and a growing sanctification, through "faith in his blood," are seldom stated, or even clearly implied. The "distinctive character" inscribed upon the Church of England, as well as adopted by the Broad Church, would seem to be "the desire of comprehension," so far as this is in any way compatible with a disavowal of Rome, and with general orthodoxy.

Our theme, however, in this article, is not the "Broad Church," but Mr. Maurice, whose opinions are so peculiar as to test the comprehensiveness of the "Broad Church" to the utmost. We cannot suspect that any of the leading minds of the party of which we have spoken, except perhaps Mr. Kingsley, (and he is no theologian,)

would sympathize with Mr. Maurice in most of the peculiar views which he has expounded in his "Essays." On the doctrine of the atonement, indeed, there is reason to fear that few, if any of them, are right. Satisfaction for the sins of a guilty world is a doctrine which, in the evangelical sense at any rate, they do not seem to teach. But this is very far indeed from being the only point upon which Mr. Maurice is heterodox. The difficulty is to find one tenet, besides the Trinity in Unity, on which he is orthodox.

Mr. Maurice was educated a Universalist and Unitarian. This appears from an interesting letter to a friend, published in the correspondence between himself and Dr. Jelf, the principal of King's College; which gives an account of the steps by which he arrived at his present convictions. When, however, as we learn from the same record, he began to "think and feel for himself," he doubted whether the Supreme Governor was the mere personified Good Nature that Universalists and Unitarians supposed him to be. Nor could he accept the Unitarian interpretation, or rather distortion, of the sense of *αἰώνιος*, (*eternal* or *everlasting*,) in Matt. xxv. 46. He says of himself, at this time, "I despised the Universalist and Unitarian theories as weak: I do not know that I found anything at all better." After a while, he "began in earnest to seek God for himself;" and then found that "*selfishness*" was the plague of his nature, and that it was impossible for him "to trust in any Being who did not hate selfishness, and desire to raise his creatures out of it." Such a Being seemed to him equally to differ from the "mere image of good nature" of the Universalists, and from the "mere Sovereign" of the Calvinists. Such a Being he thought he found in the "God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ." In HIM he could trust as his Father, and as "one absolute in goodness." Believing thus in the Father, he could not but accept the Son; and, believing in the Father and the Son, he found himself also compelled to "confess a Spirit proceeding from the Father and the Son, distinct from them, perfectly one with them." These convictions, he informs us, "he did not receive of man, neither was taught them;" that is to say, the process was purely subjective. The voice and teaching of revelation seem to have had very little authority in this matter. He believed in God's revelation just so far as this seemed to tally with his own *à priori* needs and convictions.

Having thus begun by believing in God because, and *merely* because, he believed in himself, it was natural to expect that his faith in divine revelation would terminate where his own subjective feelings or convictions refused any further to follow. Hence, having accepted as the object of his trust a Being whose character corresponded with

his own standard and idea of "absolute goodness," he found it impossible to attribute to this Being any quality or procedure which he conceived to be incompatible with such "absolute goodness." On this ground, though he felt compelled to believe in a God whose love wars with selfishness, and whose good is ever striving to oppose and extirpate evil, and who therefore meets and visits selfishness, or sin, (terms which, according to him, are precise equivalents,) with present counteraction and discouragement, and will continue to do so ever and everywhere so long as such selfishness, or sin, shall have any place in the universe,—yet, the idea of a God of law and judgment, who visits, in any case, past transgression with present and future fixed and irreversible *punishment*, was an idea which he could not but discard as inconsistent with his own conception of "absolute goodness;" that is to say, he had no feeling for the majesty of law in the Governor of the universe. The thought of the Governor was lost in that of the Father; and the righteousness which awards penalties or rewards according to the character and conduct of the subjects, became, to his view, a dark and ungodlike shadow, which must fly before the face of the divine charity.

Under the influence of such preconceptions as these, we learn, from the letter to which we have referred, that Mr. Maurice long ago decided against the doctrine of eternal punishment. But the same strain of thought and feeling led him also, very consistently, to deny the eternity of rewards as judicially fixed and determined. In a word, he seems to have given up, from an early period of his career, the idea that the present life is a probation, and that hereafter there will be a judicial settlement of all cases. He has not found himself able to acquiesce in the all but universal faith and tradition, that there is to come, sooner or later, a judicial review of the past, and allotment for the future. The only judgment he knows is a living, self-manifesting power, which operates perpetually and universally through the laws, according to which God regulates all things. Probation, according to him, is either done away or it is protracted through eternity. Meantime, he cherishes the trust that, in the end, love will prevail everywhere, and forever, over all evil.

To reconcile these ideas with Scripture might seem difficult: but, according to the process of Mr. Maurice's convictions, they must be true, independently of Scripture teaching or authority; and therefore Scripture *must* be reconciled to *them*. How this is to be done we shall come to see more particularly by-and-by. Meantime, we subjoin, in a note, the conclusions at which Mr. Maurice, at so early a stage of his course,—when he "began in earnest to seek God for

himself,"—had arrived on the points we have opened, as these conclusions are given by himself in the afore-mentioned letter.*

At what time precisely Mr. Maurice worked out for himself thus far his peculiar scheme of doctrinal and speculative opinions we have not the means of ascertaining; but it was doubtless before he went to college, since one of so honest a temper as he—being brought up a Universalist and Unitarian—would never have undertaken to sign the articles of the Church of England while still holding Unitarian views: and we have seen that his adoption of the scheme we have sketched from his own report, dates from the period of his earliest earnest thinkings on the subject of religion. But the wonder of the case is, how, notwithstanding his acceptance of the doctrine of the Trinity, he could suppose himself, while holding such views, to be much less disqualified than he would have been as a Unitarian Universalist for entering the Church of England. Assuredly such doctrines as his are opposed to those which form the root and life of all the doctrinal and devotional formularies of that Church. Indeed, he must have subscribed to the thirty-nine articles in a sense which could scarcely have been understood as agreeing with even the most general meaning and intent of those by whom they were drawn up, and by whom they were adopted and authenticated. It appears, however, from his letter in reply to Dr. Jelf, that in the year 1845 he wrote a pamphlet, in which he argued that it ought not to be held needful that the articles should be subscribed to in the sense which they may undoubtedly have borne when they were drawn up. And hence we can the more easily understand how he found himself able

---

* "My duty, then, I feel is this. 1. To assert that which I know,—that which God has revealed,—his absolute, universal love, in all possible ways, and without any limitation. 2. To tell myself and all men, that to know this love, and to be moulded by it, is the blessing we are to seek. 3. To say that this is eternal life. 4. To say that the want of it is eternal death. 5. To say that if they believe in the Son of God they have eternal life. 6. To say that if they have not the Son of God they have not life. 7. Not to say who has not the Son of God, because I do not know. 8. Not to say how long any one may remain in eternal death, because I do not know. 9. Not to say that all will necessarily be raised out of eternal death, because I do not know. 10. Not to judge any man before the time, or to judge other men at all, because Christ has said, 'Judge not, that ye be not judged.' 11. Not to play with Scripture, by quoting passages which have not the slightest connexion with the subject; such as, 'Where the tree falleth it shall lie.' 12. Not to invent a scheme of purgatory, and to take upon myself the office of Divine Judge. 13. Not to deny God a right of using punishments, at any time or anywhere, for the reformation of his creatures. 14. Not to contradict Christ's words, 'These shall be beaten with few, these with many stripes,' for the sake of maintaining a theory of the equality of sins. 15. Not to think any punishment of God's so great as his saying, 'Let them alone.'"

X 766198

to sign these formularies without scruple, and can estimate the significance of the fact, that his first publication, issued in the year 1835, was entitled, "Subscription no Bondage."

A still more puzzling point is, how a clergyman of earnest spirit, popular sympathies, and forcible genius, holding such views, could, from year to year, be advanced in the Church, and ultimately promoted to positions of great responsibility and commanding influence, in the very halls where, with a more than ordinary religious strictness, the rising youth, and especially the embryo clergy of that Church, receive their mental and moral training. Somewhere there must have been great laxity in this matter; for, though Mr. Maurice has not until recently fully disclosed and developed his specific views, yet it appears from a volume, entitled, "Christmas Day and other Sermons," published in the year 1843, that so early as the year 1839 he was regularly engaged in delivering to the inmates of Guy's Hospital, of which institution he was at that time chaplain, doctrinal expositions which ignored the atonement, and explained away the fact of human depravity; resolving all the evil that is in mankind into the perpetual influence, *ab extra*, of the Evil Spirit operating upon the spirits of all men, and taking advantage of their circumstances. In the same volume is fully enough disclosed that peculiar view of the preliminary justification and regeneration of humanity, abstractly and universally, in Christ, which will be found so largely expanded in his "Essays." A little later also he published his "Warburtonian Lectures," on the Epistle to the Hebrews; in which volume the doctrine of the atonement is silently set aside, although Christ's priesthood and sacrifice are of course largely treated of. More recently, again, in his volume on the "Old Testament," the doctrine of the fall of man is ingeniously and subtilely put to rest; and a system of doctrine is sometimes laid down, and sometimes assumed, exactly coincident with the teachings of his former works on the points we have specified. Nor in any of his works will anything be found of a contrary character, or of a truly orthodox or evangelical colour. Much there is that is good, wise, beautiful, and eloquent; there is much earnest practical teaching, specially appropriate to the civil and economical needs of the present time: seldom has any one been found who could, by the light of the divine records of the Old Testament, read more searching, faithful, and impressive lessons upon the subject of relative duties to men of every grade and class; indeed, as the earnest and eloquent interpreter and spokesman of the lessons of sacred history, he has rarely been equalled. Never, indeed, has there been a teacher more deeply impressed with the fact, that Jehovah is the living and ruling God of men and

of the universe, nor one better able and more earnestly resolved to impress this fact as a living truth upon the hearts of all that listened to him: yet, with all this, Mr. Maurice is never and nowhere the preacher of a gospel of salvation to a guilty and fallen race, through faith in the atoning merits of Christ's blood. Never and nowhere does he preach to a sinful world of a future judgment, or exhort man "to flee from the wrath to come." Whatever else he may preach, he does *not* preach Christ's gospel. In this respect he has been consistent from first to last. While, to refer to a different but yet a kindred point, his views on the subject of inspiration—particularly, of the prophetic inspiration, as developed more especially in his work on "the Prophets and Kings,"—are so lax and singular, that if they had been found in the work of a German professor, they would have been branded as outrageous Rationalism. And yet, notwithstanding all this, Mr. Maurice was successively promoted to be Professor of English Literature, Professor of Ecclesiastical History, and even (*mirabile dictu!*) Professor of Divinity, at King's College, London. Long ago, he exchanged his chaplaincy of the maimed and diseased pauper inmates at Guy's Hospital for the chaplaincy of the learned and influential Society of Barristers, at Lincoln's Inn.

It was scarcely to be anticipated, however, that this course could continue forever. Whatever may have been the negligence of the leading authorities connected with King's College, they are no doubt, and have been, strict Church-of-England men; and whatever may be the comprehensive liberalism of that Church, she could scarcely, in an earnest season of thought like the present, tolerate in her chief places of official influence and duty tenets so glaringly contrary to her system of doctrines as those which we have found that Mr. Maurice had long held. Negative heresy she might not bestir herself to detect or analyze; but positive out-spokenness in vital heresy is a different matter. A century ago, a deist might be a bishop, and a Unitarian high in preferment in the Anglican Church. But things are different now. Then, out of Methodism, there was scarcely any earnestness extant, whether in religion or aught else. Now, the world is full of energy, and the age teems with earnest spirits. Now, sincerity, whether in error or in truth, for evil or for good, is counted the "one thing needful," and earnestness is rated as heroism. Now, bishops and bishops' chaplains really examine the candidates for ordination in divinity, and expect them to be men of ministerial habits and behaviour. Churchmen now have convictions and opinions more or less definite,—whether they call themselves "High," or "Low," or "Broad." The "Broad Church," indeed, may adopt, as its motto, "comprehensiveness;" but even this party profess to

adhere, not only firmly, but warmly, to points essential. They maintain that there is a common faith and experience in which real Christians, of every age and denomination,—Fénélon as well as Pascal, High Church as well as Low,—agree and coincide; their test being rather experimental and practical than doctrinal. All parties agree that institutions must work out their own meaning; and that boards and faculties must appoint teachers and professors, who shall substantially and fairly represent the views and convictions of those that appoint them. It was, therefore, impossible, after Mr. Maurice, in his "Essays," had fully disclosed the singularity and heterodoxy of his views on every point of theology, (the Trinity, we think,—so far as the *offices* of the Persons are concerned,—can scarcely be considered an exception,) that he could much longer retain his functions as Professor of Divinity in so strict a Church-of-England institution as King's College.

But how ever came Mr. Maurice to be appointed Professor of Divinity in this college? is a question which our wondering readers will ask. We certainly cannot pretend to answer this question. Only we have heard that Mr. Maurice first entered the college under the patronage of the Bishop of London; and *his* bill of health would probably be considered as establishing his Anglican orthodoxy for not a few years to come. Then we are sure that Dr. Jelf, the principal of the college, has not read (though perhaps he may have looked into) Mr. Maurice's books. The tone of his letter to Mr. Maurice is sufficient proof of this; and Mr. Maurice even taunts him with it, and tells him he might, "if he had ever read one of his books," have been aware of some of those heterodox views of Mr. Maurice, which, as recently disclosed at full length, have so much surprised and scandalized him, when, in 1846, he solicited him to accept the professorship of theology. Indeed, Dr. Jelf did not read anything of Mr. Maurice's famous "Essays" until some considerable time after their publication, nor until his attention was specifically and authoritatively called to them by his diocesan, the Bishop of London; and even then he only read the last Essay, containing one, and that not the most vital or radical, of his many heresies: and on the merits of this particular Essay, and in reference to this single heresy, was the case of the professor adjudged, under the direction of Dr. Jelf, and Mr. Maurice deprived of his professorship. And yet Mr. Maurice has long been a most popular and influential writer, and has dealt in his writings with subjects most vitally connected with divinity and the theological interpretation of Scripture. So much pains had the principal taken to satisfy himself as to the competency of his Professor of Divinity!

Nothing can excuse such negligence as this. We suppose, however, that Mr. Maurice, having signed twice or thrice the thirty-nine articles, having entered King's College with the recommendation of his able and vigilant diocesan,—the same who at length called Dr. Jelf's attention to his heterodoxy,—having proved himself an accomplished teacher, and gained a high reputation among a highly intellectual class, as an earnest and practical preacher, and having acquired, in a singular degree, the warm and affectionate personal esteem of those whom he had been accustomed to teach,—was naturally, and without investigation, advanced from stage to stage in his official position at the college, till, at last, he was promoted to the Professorship of Divinity.

The Bishop of London seems to have called Dr. Jelf's attention to Mr. Maurice's Essays about midsummer of last year, or a little later. In a note, dated, "Christ Church, Oxford, July 8, 1853," Dr. Jelf informs his "dear Professor Maurice" that his "attention had been called, by high authority, to the conclusion of the last of his Theological Essays, lately published;" that he had read the Essay, and was of opinion that therein he "seemed to throw an atmosphere of doubt on the simple meaning of the word *eternal*, and to convey a general notion of ultimate salvation for all." Thus originated the correspondence between Dr. Jelf and Mr. Maurice, in the course of which Mr. Maurice communicated to Dr. Jelf that interesting letter to a friend, from which we quoted some time back, and in which he recounts the process of his transition from Unitarian and Universalist views to the position which he has since occupied. After Dr. Jelf, by a preliminary correspondence, had satisfied himself as to what Mr. Maurice's meaning was in the Essay he had referred to, he prepared and sent to Mr. Maurice a long letter, in which he refutes the views of his correspondent, shows their contrariety to the teaching of Scripture and of the Church of England, and intimates to him that, on the grounds of the agreement drawn out in the letter, he should feel it his duty to submit the question of Mr. Maurice's further continuance in office to the Council of the college.* This letter of Dr. Jelf's was communicated to Mr. Maurice in printed slips, piece-meal, as it was written, (being considered as a sort of informal indictment,) in order that he might have full

---

* In this closing letter, Dr. Jelf says: "A privilege, for which there is no precedent in our Church, has been accorded to King's College, namely, that of founding, with the full sanction of all the bishops, a theological department; with the understanding that twenty-six bishops will accept the certificate of the principal, presented by a candidate for holy orders, in lieu of a university degree;" and adds, "A college so trusted and privileged must not permit its orthodoxy to be

opportunity to prepare a reply to it; and on October 14, after three months' correspondence and delay, the whole case, including a final letter from Mr. Maurice, in reply to Dr. Jelf, was laid before the Council of King's College. The Council, at an adjourned meeting, held October 28, "pronounced," to quote Mr. Maurice's own account, "the opinions expressed and the doubts indicated in the 'Essays,' and the correspondence respecting future punishments and the final issues of the day of judgment, to be of dangerous tendency, and likely to unsettle the minds of the theological students;" and "decided, further, that his continuance as professor would be seriously detrimental to the interests of the college." From that day the professor's lectures, both on "Ecclesiastical History" and on "Divinity," came to an end.

It will be observed, from the above account, that the decision of the Council was founded upon Mr. Maurice's opinions relating to only one point—and that, however momentous, not the most central or essential—of his theological opinions; a point, indeed, which was, in the original edition of the Essays, only brought in incidentally, or at least secondarily, in the latter part of his Essays on the "Trinity in Unity." It appears that this was the only point to which a certain "high authority" had called the principal's attention; and though, at first, as we gather from the printed correspondence, the principal very naturally resolved, and indeed engaged to Mr. Maurice,

---

even suspected." And yet Dr. Jelf rested in ignorance as to the substance, tendency, and merits of the theological publications of his Professor of Divinity; one singular instance of which occurs in this very letter. Writing of the Articles of the Church of England, he says: "There are several other theological truths which are also omitted, because there was no occasion to speak of them. The compendium, for instance, contains no assertion—at least in direct terms *eo nomine*—of the inspiration of the Holy Scriptures; nor is there any allusion in the present text of the Articles to the general resurrection of all men, with their bodies, at Christ's coming: yet you would not call *those* open questions; you would not say that a theological professor who disputes either of those truths can be safely trusted to teach the students in the theological department of King's College." Now, a more curiously unfortunate *argumentum ad hominem* than this, as addressed to Mr. Maurice, it would be difficult to imagine; for, as to the inspiration of the Scriptures, it is manifest, not only from the "Essays," but from several of his previous works, to which he himself refers in a note to the "Essays," (p. 323,) and one of which was published many years ago, that Mr. Maurice does not believe in this tenet in any other sense than that in which a Rationalist might profess to believe in it,—that is, he does not believe the inspiration of the sacred writers to differ, in any essential particular, from that teaching of the Spirit of which a pious peasant may be conscious, while reading those Scriptures; and as to the general resurrection of all men, with their bodies, and Christ's second coming, to judge the quick and the dead, these are tenets which, in the "Essays," Mr. Maurice boldly and altogether repudiates.

that he would carefully read the whole volume, in order the more safely and accurately to form his judgment upon the case, yet afterward it is evident that he judged it better to confine his attention to the particular Essay to which he had been originally pointed. On every account we think this is to be lamented; the controversy was thus not only narrowed, but distorted, and a doctrine was made primary and central which gave Mr. Maurice every advantage in the sight of mere secularists and half-believers, and which even the profound believer would always require to be viewed in its connexion with and dependence upon the truly central truths which form the very heart and essence of Christianity. Very possibly it might have been inconvenient to take up the grand doctrine of the atonement, with its associated doctrines of human depravity, justification, and regeneration, as the root of the whole matter. Perhaps on these doctrines some of Mr. Maurice's colleagues, and of the members of the Council, may have been divided in opinion; and it might probably be found even that views were held, as to more than one of them, by some of the most distinguished of those involved in the responsibility of this matter, which are far from agreeing with the evangelical orthodoxy of the Reformers.

There is another thing to be noted. The Bishop of London thought it his duty to direct the principal's attention to the professor's heterodoxy; but Mr. Maurice is still a fully accredited clergyman of the Church of England, within the diocese of the said bishop, and still holds the chaplaincy of Lincoln's Inn: so that the bishop is either powerless in this case, or shrinks from an invidious responsibility in his own person which, notwithstanding, he felt bound to lay on another; or he thinks that heterodoxy, though it may disqualify a clergyman for a professorship, does not disqualify him for the office of the public ministry. We believe the truth to be, that, as Mr. Maurice has subscribed to the Articles and formularies of the Church, and holds to them, (even to the Athanasian creed,) in a sense, the bishop is practically powerless. The Gorham case would be a very trifle to a leviathan affair like this of Mr. Maurice, embracing so many particulars of doctrine, and involving distinctions and reasonings so subtle and abstract.

To give our readers anything like an intelligible *conspectus* of the points included in this case will require a separate paper. Having, therefore, disposed in our present number of the history of the controversy, we shall devote a subsequent article to an examination of the subject-matter of the "Essays," out of which this controversy has arisen.

Art. III.—THE PRINCIPLE OF SOVEREIGNTY.

Histoire de la Souveraineté, ou Tableau des Institutions et des Doctrines Politiques Comparées. Par Alfred Sudre. 1 vol., 4to. Paris, 1854. New-York: Hector Bossange

A double advance upon the ordinary mode of treating politics is promised by the title of this work. It announces that the subject will not only be viewed *historically*, but that the history also will be viewed *comparatively*. The former of the improvements belongs to doctrine or philosophy; the other is methodical or logical. But both are quite concurrently and characteristically scientific.

In fact, it is the received character of science, in every subject, to employ the process commonly called "inductive." But this procedure is a consequence of the historical point of view. This point of view, or principle, attained but tardily in all phenomena, is compassed later in some than others, in proportion to complexity. The order of this succession demands a word of explanation.

In the phenomena of the simplest class, whose laws compose the mathematics, the attainment is the earliest, and was accordingly spontaneous; whence the prevalent illusion about those sciences as formed, exceptionally, by deduction or *à priori*, from "innate principles." It may be urged, indeed, that their subject-matter, which regards the statical phase of nature, must be consequently insusceptible of all historical consideration. Undoubtedly the alteration in inert bodies is so slow and secular as to elude the observation and the experience of humanity, and to be safely disregarded in the constitution of special science. Yet positive knowledge, in even such bodies, implies a history, an evolution, but one restricted to the intellect itself. The mathematics are the result of a *subjective* induction.

To this procedure is superadded, on passing up into the natural sciences, the obligation of an *objective* induction, based on history proper. In fact, the objects in this organic and animate department exhibit obviously a rise, a progress, a revolution; in short, a history. It was accordingly this obviousness of the condition of mutability that brought the method of induction into predominance in modern times, and gave the corresponding section of the scale of science (through Bacon, also) the quite significant but vicious title of Natural *History*. On the other hand, the same direct accessibility to observation served to mitigate the augmentation of complexity. Yet to entirely overcome it, the simple method of induction had to

assume a corresponding complication. This is the origin and character of the quite recent "Comparative Method," first applied by Cuvier to zoological anatomy; even as the corresponding doctrine of an historical development is scarce established, to the present day, in this extreme limit of the natural sciences.

There is thus, then, a distinct advancement in extending both the processes to the supreme and still more complicate domain of the social sciences. In fact, the laws of this department are in reality a combination of the objective and subjective phenomena of the two lower sections. Their character is then *relational*, and so, by excellence, comparative. They offer, also, in like preëminence, the character of history; offer it in such excess, indeed, as to become a disadvantage. The variation is so rapid in the social order of phenomena that they appear to be subordinated to no settled law at all. The difficulty of *synthesis* produces here the same illusion as the difficulty of *analysis* does in the laws of the mathematics. The very rapidity of the mutation, at one extremity of the scale of nature, comes to substantially the same effect as does its slowness at the other, in driving baffled investigation to imagine "innate" or mystic principles. Not the only case wherein the two extremes of motion meet, as is known popularly; and as do also, say some philosophers, the opposites indeed of all things; they mean, however, doubtless, in relation to the ken of man—*himself a cumulative compromise between extremes.* But the difficulty, the illusion will be one day vanquished, at both the ends, by the reciprocal elucidation of the mathematical and social sciences. This, however, is not the subject now before us. Our object in this brief explanation was to define the high import, both as a symptom of the "march of mind" and as a suggestion to future writers, of the title-page of M. Sudre.

But does he realize the implied promise of his title in the work? We are forced to say decidedly that he does not. And, in passing proof, we can do no better than transcribe his programme *in extenso,* as programmes generally are not apt to be more modest than the performance.

Commencing duly with a definition of his main subject of Sovereignty as "the power in general that controls the state, or the collective powers by which its functions are exercised," he proceeds to add:—

> "Thus far the agreement is general. The difference is about the portion or the property of the society to be received as the constituent or the criterion of the sovereignty. Does the sovereignty belong to number or to intellect? To birth, to property, or to talent? To the nation, or to a king? To religion, or to reason? If to number, is it independently of all qualification of aptitude, morality, or stake in the public weal? If to property and birth, what

> guarantees the weak against oppression? If to the king, what is his really legitimate title to the throne? If to talent or merit, who shall be judge? If to reason or religion, who is their organ? Again, are there governments of fact as well as of right? What is the characteristic of legitimacy in a government? Are force, fraud, and chance the sole principles in politics, or not rather justice and right? Is there a form of goverment perfect in itself, and which might be imposed with reason upon all communities alike? Or is the goodness of a government not, in its nature, relative to times, to localities, to manners? May nations, with impunity, in organizing their institutions, consult but the dictates of their wild will, or of some speculative theory? Or ought they not to consider their historical antecedents, the conditions of their territory, of their neighbours, &c.? Such are the principal questions which have been raised in the course of history in reference to the theory and applications of the sovereign power."—P. 2.

To set forth questions and the systems they relate to, to compare them and to search for the peccant part in each,—such is the certainly imposing project of the author. It is pursued in the present volume only through the period of antiquity, from primal India to the Roman empire inclusive. But as the views of M. Sudre in political philosophy imply that the governments of the modern world are mere repetitions of the ancient, there can, to him at least, be no injustice in pronouncing thus far on the execution, while the materials are only too abundant and too important for a single article.

Now this conception of a *repetition* evinces well the imperfection with which he seizes the true historical philosophy and method. The insufficiency is shown more fully in the crowd of queries above recited, and which he places, with the common notion on the subject, in competition. A just idea of the bare principle of a perpetual variation, such as all history implies and all societies exhibit, would have suggested that there might be possibly no rivalry between the questions, but that the forms, the conditions, the criteria which they contrast, may all be right or quite the contrary, *according to the circumstances.* The relativity to circumstance he does however recognise, we see, in the alternative which he proposes for the chimera of a perfect government, or one which would be best for all communities alike. And yet not one of his other questions but is as absolute and as chimerical. It is, for instance, not more absurd to discuss the *abstract* preferability between two governmental forms, such as democracy and despotism, than between two principles of sovereignty, such as force and right, or two exponents of its legitimacy, such as religion and reason. As there are epochs of humanity when mere number must wield the sovereignty in the absence of broad distinctions of birth, property, or intellect, such as, for instance, among the Hurons of the Six Nations, so are there also times when force is a juster principle than right, the latter being as yet unfelt, and, of course, inapplicable; and when religion is a better

organ of civil government than reason, because the only reason then accessible to the governed. By like attention to the special circumstances or conditions of each people, the various other institutions which the author finds in conflict, would fall consistently and even necessarily into their places back of the line of history. The supposed conflict is but the result of their cross convergence into a focus, by the narrow intellect that can conceive them only in reference to its own age, and thus considers them as rival entities all existing from the commencement. M. Sudre appears to be breaking free from this common confusion in his recognition of the force of circumstances; what he needed, to do it fully, is some conception of their laws of action. But so profoundly is he here at fault that his enumeration of the ruling circumstances, namely, territory, time, tradition, manners, (*mœurs,*) omits the greatest, or rather the all-including element of the diversity, to wit, the *grade of intellectual civilization.*

To appreciate his treatise, to authenticate our criticism, and to indicate the proper principles of all historical interpretation, it will be therefore indispensable to sketch this scale of social measurement, in fact derivable from a sound analysis of M. Sudre's own materials. The illustration of the laws of progress will also vindicate the ways of Providence in their consistent impartiality to all conditions of mankind.

In all conditions and at all times, in fact, the vital object of civil government consists in guaranteeing the common interests against encroachment by the individual. The means were consequently, first, direct, or by repressing *forcibly* the private appetites; they became subsequently indirect, in proclaiming *voluntarily* the public interests; they are found, finally, reciprocal, in recognising *rationally* that there is no real collision between the interests of both descriptions. Hence three developments of human government successive, but superposed, and which repress—the first with force, and by *authority* of the divine will; the next with legislation, and by authority of human will; the final with organization, and by authority of science or reason. In history, the foremost corresponds with despotism; the second with anarchy, or the epoch of "free" governments; the last with true liberty, or the future governments of science and duty.

Though thus so secular in evolution that the second epoch is not yet exhausted, it must be noted that all three of the elements exist in germ in every government which takes its character from the relative predominance of any one of them. The purest despot must promulge his will, and even that will is sometimes rational; as, on

the other hand, the reign of reason will never be brought to a perfection wherein the government may dispense wholly with the use of force. So, *ex converso*, in another aspect, the individual despotism will be always needed in the most consummate organization; while a species of organization is found in primitive despotisms—we allude to the famous system of castes. Were these things otherwise, the social system could not be deemed an organism—of which this primitive conglomeration of its future forms is the definition. Accordingly, the primitive despot is judge and priest as well as warrior; and it is only toward the second epoch that the triple function begins to ramify into our modern executive, judiciary, and legislature.

This is the dynamic or historical evolution, and it is operated on the principles of government or sovereignty. The statical, which is concerned with the forms, the organization, is operated on the basis of personalities. Hence this aspect is much the earlier of the two to be appreciated—persons being more visible than principles. It is imagined even still, by the herd of writers, not to speak of readers, to contain the entire doctrine of social science. The physiology of the social body is but just now breaking on the leading intellects of the age. We have, however, in this exposition, placed the latter foremost, as most fundamental, and also as the special clew to the construction of the book before us. Now for the governmental forms, or the personal evolutions over each in order of the three principles unfolded.

These forms, being determined by the number of governing citizens of which the state may be composed, are, of course, indefinite. They thus must be, like all such series, divided summarily into three: the governments of the one, of the few, of the whole. The main transitions intermediate are deemed degenerate or incipient forms, according as the thing is judged from one or other of the type extremes; and the same remark should be extended to the evolution of the principles. The three type forms are known as monarchy, oligarchy, and democracy. But these appellatives were imposed in the commencement of the middle epoch, and on a principle entirely different from that adopted in the primitive period. Here, in fact, it was the notion of generation that prevailed, and gave the name of patriarchy, which applies generally to the first series. There were monarchical patriarchies, as, for example, in the extreme East; oligarchical patriarchies, as in Assyria and Judea; democratical patriarchies, as the *paterfamilias* of the Roman republic. The diversity of historic titles being thus explained, the Greek terms seem the most convenient to be extended to all three epochs,

with the addition of a specific epithet commemorative of the several principles. Thus the monarchy, oligarchy, and democracy of the reign of force might be distinguished as patriarchal or theocratical; under the principle of human will, they might be termed moral or constitutional; they may, when passed into the sphere of reason, be termed natural or scientific.

It is important to consider, finally, the wide divergency between these forms, as to the nature of the government, from one to another of the successive principles. Thus the democracy of force, which was the nature of the Roman empire, differs widely from our American democracy of will; as this in turn is no less distant from the great republic of reason. And so of the other forms, the monarchy and oligarchy, of which the latter becomes finally an aristocracy. Judge from this of the political knowledge that huddles all those deep diversities into identity of nature, misled by unity of name!

Postponing the discussion of the various origins assigned to society, the author opens the historic ages with primeval India and Egypt; of which he sums up the constitution as consisting of the caste system in the civil order, and of absolute monarchy, hereditary or elective, in the political. He conceives both these institutions to be primordial in the two countries, and the former to be, moreover, quite peculiar to them. But he errs in both opinions, as we have shown. The mode of monarchy in question has in no country been the earliest government; it, on the contrary, is the latest of a long series, their generalization. Political monarchy, as the great Vico was the first to proclaim in principle, "does not spring up suddenly like frogs after a shower of rain." It was accordingly the result, in even India and Egypt, of innumerable minor combinations, lost to history, but which analogy describes as military, federative, patriarchal—the latter, indeed, continuing to be the character of the great monarchies.

The allegation that the caste system was peculiar to the same two nations is alike inaccurate, at least in principle, or in the sense of being accidental. It might have been so in point of fact,—that is, confined to India and Egypt,—and at the same time be the result of a universal law; but the fact itself is evidently otherwise. We find this primary mode of social classification in other countries, even countries so unconnected with the preceding as the New World. It appears also in the well-known "classes" of the Greek and Roman republics, though in a form of duly advanced dissolution. It was this circumstance of declination, and, on the other hand, of gradual rise, that misled the author to regard the system as being peculiar to the countries named, where it is merely observed in cul-

minant development. For the progressive evolution which produced the various graduation must have been operated by transition as well in geography as in chronology,—must have embraced a great diversity of derivative civilizations. But M. Sudre, who knew not even the existence of any such law, could not have possibly pursued, amid the variation of its effects, the real identity of the institution of castes, and was, in consequence, led to conceive it as something insulated and particular.

So much is this so that, from its presence in even the second of the recognised cases, he infers an Indian colonization of Egypt. But the very closeness of the analogy would rather argue, we have seen, the contrary. For no transplanted institution, and more especially in a conquered country, can, according to the law of progress, retain the stamp of the metropolis; whereas a general resemblance would be the necessary consequence of independent centres of development at like maturity. For instance, Egypt had, besides colonies, sent numerous customs to ancient Greece; and yet so little was a likeness traceable that the parentage has been often questioned; while, on the other hand, it is as certain that she never sent either colonies or customs to the native Mexicans, who, however, resembled her so strikingly at once in arts and institutions, that certain writers have derived the Aztecs from the banks of the Nile, on the same principle as M. Sudre brings the Egyptians from the Ganges, but in a case where the absurdity is rendered physically more appreciable. M. Sudre has, indeed, the intelligence to hesitate somewhat about his derivation, in view of certain fundamental differences which he notes between the two nations, such as the language, the hieroglyphics, the monuments; and these, in truth, make more decidedly against his case than he even suspects—indeed, so strongly as to imply, perhaps, a derivation just the contrary. So inevitable is this oscillation between errors the most opposite, in those who enter the maze of history without the leading strings of its philosophy!

The principle of caste, and even process of its formation, we may find a fitter opportunity of elucidating more particularly, in some concrete instance and historic age of the operation. As to the corresponding governments, they were all founded upon force; in due conformity with the deductions of philosophy. For this was still the real character of even the theocratic systems: distinguished merely by the predominance of the priestly caste above the military, they but substituted (by, however, a marked progression from brute matter) the abstract sanction of the force of gods for the force of men. The inability of those infant people to apprehend a less simple sanction than physical force of either men or gods, was the

occasion of the uniformity of despotic government in Asia; not either climate, as Montesquieu thought, nor, as Heeren subjoined, polygamy, nor any other of the various theories which are recited by our author. Accordingly, the Asiatics, in their emigrations to the West, are found renouncing despotism beneath a climate no less oppressive: we mean in the Phœnician cities along the Syrian and the Libyan coast.

M. Sudre recognises this essential transformation, and proceeds next to the analysis of this new order of communities. They were distinguished by the disappearance of all castes, even the sacerdotal. They were, instead, enclosed by "fortified cities," and also formed confederations, as the Greek cities, too, did afterward, and even lately the American colonies. At first the government was royal, but strongly tempered with aristocracy. This was the condition of the primitive cities, the Phœnician proper. In the derivative, such as Carthage, the royal remnant disappeared, and the aristocracy assumed the sovereignty unrestricted: for the two suffetes were judicial officers, imagined ignorantly to be kings, by Greek writers, who no doubt were thinking of the Spartan constitution. It might be added in corroboration of this Carthaginian change of government, that the great city owed, by a fortune perhaps peculiar in social history, its civic origin to a *patrician* emigration. Its founders were in fact no other than the aristocracy expelled from Tyre by the predominance of a disorderly democracy in that sailor city; an event which at the same time left a new remove from despotism, but one so wide as to be the subversion of all government. The wretched rabble, thus emasculated of its natural defenders, fell back soon after beneath the yoke of Asiatic despotism.

On the subject of the Phœnician or Aramean cities, as he styles them, M. Sudre confines his notice to the two or three former characteristics, and even of these gives neither explanation nor coördination. The latter has been indicated by the order of our statement, and the addition of the particulars about Carthage and Tyre. We see that, taken in the aggregate, this group of governments presents a series, proceeding duly from absolute monarchy, through oligarchy, to democracy. The explanation was above anticipated in our theoretic programme, applying as well to the observations of the author. Thus, the general absence of the caste system was a necessary consequence of the fact itself of emigration, *which is an act of liberation.* This definition solves spontaneously the liberal progress of the governments. These, however, to the last, retained the principle of force, which we saw, in fact, the Tyrian populace assert

against the aristocracy. Indeed, the principle could not be altered till, through progressive emancipations, the social system reached the consummation of its dissolution in pure democracy. Here it was no longer possible to found a government upon force, for all resistance had been destroyed, and force, without it, is a nonentity. Recourse was therefore had instinctively to an abstraction for a social fulcrum. From the arm and the appetite of men themselves, or of their gods, and which were seen in a democracy to be all eager and all empty, the source of sovereignty must pass up into a more auspicious region, where the strife for power would be less destructive, and its title be less intelligible; it must spring up in the *head*, and be the *will*. From this compression, and through the medium of the theocratic modification of force, arose spontaneously the moral principle of government. But it could not be in Tyre, amid the inequalities that still subsisted of wealth, birth, tradition, and which were attached to the very soil. The thing could germinate only in a people at once transported to a new territory, and in whom all sentiments of aristocracy had been extinguished by protracted servitude. This double exigence will, accordingly, explain precisely the singularity that M. Sudre is so much astonished at, in the next polity he meets in history.

The Mosaic polity of the Hebrews, he observes, was founded upon *compact*. The covenant with Jehovah, thus the earliest *constitution*, was effectually an act of the national will. The suffrage upon which it rested was indeed so universal as to embrace not only all male adults, but also the women and children, and to imply even the domestic animals: for the Divine Source which had inspired it was better aware than human lawgivers how important is the contribution of these useful creatures to social progress. How comes it that the Women's Rights folks are so ill acquainted with their Bible as to overlook this most authoritative and *à fortiori* argument? It is perhaps because the inspired suffrage was not founded upon *rights*, but, on the contrary, upon *duties*, as declared in fact in the Ten Commandments.

The Hebrew suffrage differed also from the modern notion in the mode of exercise. It was permitted to pronounce but once, and the result was binding upon all posterity. Such, in fact, were the conditions of the covenant with God. But they are also the implied conditions of all political organizations, which reckon little on the innovations of human progress. Even our own Constitution affects essential perpetuity. This, however, was not maintained in even the compact of the chosen people, who soon relapsed into the natural course of things. Even immediately after Moses, for example,

came Joshua, the military chief succeeding to the spiritual; just as Romulus was followed by Numa, with a mere inversion of the order, corresponding to the origin of the two states. For, as the military chief had been the founder at Rome, of course the spiritual must of necessity have been the follower; and *vice versa* in Judea, or rather, Israel, for the same reason. What is essential to both the cases was, the conjunction of the two elements—the active and the intellectual—in the constitution of the body politic.

Again, the judges, who followed next, and were a sort of presidents of the republic, are the Hebrew analogues of the consuls at Rome. The very denominations are accordingly synonymous. Both were an elective and transitional mode of monarchy, and ended alike in regal despotism. They took the name from the main business of a government in barbarous ages, which is known to be the administration of justice. The Roman senate might be also thought to have its counterpart in the Sanhedrim. But M. Sudre denies the organic existence of such a body,—and, we conclude, with better reason than he has been able to assign. A council of this description, as an organ of the government, was quite impossible in the absence of an aristocracy; and there could have been no aristocracy among Pharaoh's escaped bondsmen.

M. Sudre, on this occasion, makes another observation, which, indeed, is the profoundest in his book. The history of political sovereignty concerns, he says, two questions: one the *principle* or philosophical doctrine on which the government reposes; the other the *form*, the organization of its powers. "The same principle may give origin to forms of government widely different, as similar forms may, in turn, proceed from opposite principles."—P. 33. This observation, which however he introduces but incidentally, and leaves entirely undeveloped, is the very thesis of his work. He should have placed it at the beginning, and endeavoured to determine the distinctive character, the number, and the series of such principles, as well as also of the corresponding forms. His omission of this "part of Hamlet" is what we sought to supply above. Of course we are equally obliged to supplement his application of this vague dictum to the definitive delineation of the Hebrew constitution.

As to the principle, this constitution was, then, originally, a democracy, yet a government of divine will, and no longer of force. Nor could it have been otherwise in the conditions of the people. But as it formed at the same time a transition to the new order, it rested partially upon the theocratic termination of the old regime. As the Asiatic governments were theocratical monarchies, and their Ara-

mean offshoots were theocratic aristocracies, so the Hebrew constitution, as the following term of the progression, was, quite conformably to theory, a theocratical democracy. This definition is attested equally by well-interpreted observation, and supplies in fact the key to some singularities of Jewish history. Who does not recognise, for instance, the infirmities of pure democracy in two civil wars, seven foreign subjugations, and five national "apostasies," that is, revolts against the constitution—the whole in the short space of three centuries? "In those days there was no king in Israel, but *every man did that which was right in his own eyes.*" Judges xvii, 6.

Applying our second test of form, the Hebrew commonwealth had none at all. This, indeed, is the strict character, in any circumstance, of a democracy, which, on the contrary, imports denial and dissolution of all forms. The thing, moreover, was inevitable in a people incapable of all such abstract combinations. Yet, in the face of both the logical and psychological necessity, M. Sudre stands bewildered at this absence of organization. He wonders how the Hebrews, after having traversed the above reverses, and even altered their regal dynasties by free election full three times, should yet have never, to the last, attained a notion of their real malady, but been content with changing persons instead of instituting principles. He does not know, then, that the mass of men, in even our own "enlightened days," see really little more in constitutions than the individuals who are to work them, only variously distributed, and, above all, *denominated;* nay, that the social laws or powers, of which these agents are the mere exponents, and in which, however, resides exclusively the true conception of organization, are not quite familiar to even writers on the subject. Of this he makes himself again an example, in going so far as to censure Moses, and to pronounce him the primal cause of all the sufferings of his people. He gave them, says he truly, but a civil and religious, not a particle of a *political,* constitution. In fact, Moses was too well inspired not to do as Solon did by natural wisdom, and give his people not consummate institutions, but such as they could endure. And the certain sign that he went beyond, rather than fell short of, their capacity, is the posterior and persistent lapse of the constitution toward the rule of force, after he had led it to at least the confines of its land of promise—the moral principle.

To give this principle initiation was then the task assigned, in order, to the following centre of civilization on the line of history.

Upon passing to this Greek era, the author sums up the general

character of all the previous modes of government collectively as follows:—

> "Politics indissolubly united to religion, and participating in its natural immobility; the regime of castes transmitting by inheritance the right to command and the duty to obey; conquest and force the normal source of social power, and success the criterion of right; vast empires succeeding empires, and despots supplanting despots; a predestined people, of its own will, renouncing democratic liberty; on all sides the crimes of tyrants and the vices of slaves; no aspiration toward political amelioration; no idea, no doctrine respecting the ends of society, or concerning the organization of government."—P. 78.

In contrast, he presents the following outline respecting Greece:—

> "To this stagnant immobility succeeds activity and progress; to the monotony, variety of institutions and events; to the worship of despotism, the fanaticism of liberty; to the instinctive submission of slaves, the deliberate obedience of citizens; to the revolts of the brutalized multitude, the skilled contention of parties; to mystery and silence, publicity and discussion: men of eminence arise, classes are established, the divers governmental forms are evolved and discussed comparatively, political phraseologies are abstracted from events, and are applied, not upon instinct, but upon principle."—P. 78.

The facts recited in this double portrait are, in general, correct, and are to that extent conformable, it will be noted, to our programme. But the suggested appreciations are erroneous by the same test. For example, the "crimes of tyrants and the vices of slaves" is little better than the declamation of a philosophical anachronism; or, to speak more strictly, of the absence of all philosophy in the premises. The alleged crimes were but the conduct of natural guardians in all ages, who also have at all times ill-treated their minor pupils or their children; the vices, but the forced submission to this salutary slavery. The state of ignorance required analogous disciplination in both the cases, but in proportion, of course, protracted and more severe in the collective infancy. Those who talk of this as tyranny confound the infant with the adult, and judge subjectively from their own feelings, instead of objectively from the facts of history.

Another error of the author's summary is his embodying the Phœnician government, and even the Hebrew, in the same category with the Asiatic despotisms, as contrasting trenchantly with the Hellenic institutions. He himself had recognised, in fact, expressly, a progression from the utter absoluteness of the East to the comparative freedom of the African cities, and also furnished some observations that extend it further in the Hebrew commonwealth. And then the theory which we submitted for the explanation of the progression presents it graduating equably into the *foremost forms*

of the Greek system, and thus excluding the pretended contrast from the conterminous extremities. But these extremities, we say emphatically, are the highest forms of both the groups, and not the final term of the Aramean and the initial of the Hellenic, as might be fancied through a misconception of the process of development. In this respect societies are like the animal organisms, which all commence at the lowest term of the series, but in passing upward are each arrested at the form proper to its species, and therefore slope into that above it at both their limits of perfectibility.

In due accordance with this explanation, the Grecian states are not found commencing with either the principle or the disorder of democracy. On the contrary, the dawn of history presents the governments as royal; the heroic monarchies of the Homeric and the Hesiodic poems. But they were monarchies no longer of the Oriental and priestly stamp, but of the migrated and military caste: whence the absence of a sacerdotal caste, observed in all the Greek communities. The king was still, indeed, of divine birth, but he must add the human traits of strength and courage; just as the Hebrews elected Saul for the physical qualities of stature and beauty, to supplement the spiritual qualities of Samuel. The hero-monarch, in his triple functions of king, general, and priest, was also absolute, was truly "shepherd of the people:" for the assemblies of the boulé and the agora, as found in Homer, are but subsidiary to, not restrictive of, the sovereign. The former, as the name imports, was a mere ministerial council, wherein the chiefs of the tribes or nations met to consult, not to control. The agora was a simple gathering of the body of the people in the open market-place, (*agora,*) to receive ordinances, not to influence them. But these two bodies, though thus as yet in the obscurity of gestation, contained the germs of what were, successively, to seize the sovereignty of power and progress.

In fact, the monarchies were all supplanted, as we are informed by M. Sudre, by oligarchies, of which the Boulé (become the senate) was the organ: oligarchies, first of birth, and later, partly of mere wealth; by way of yielding a subordinate transition to democracy. Not democracy, however, was the direct successor, but tyranny; which, in turn, subverted everywhere the oligarchies. This well-authenticated fact of history might seem in conflict with our theory, but in reality confirms it most signally. All transitions, and more especially in social subjects, from their vast complexity, must be effected by more or less of oscillation or reaction. Thus the tyrannies of Greece were a return toward the royal form, while in spirit and effect they were a triumph of the multitude. This is evident

from bare fact, as well as theory. The tyrant, or rather usurper, (for the name originally was obnoxious to no implication of oppression or even misgovernment,) was habitually a member of the oligarchy, set up to crush the domination of his own class. But set up, then, by whom? Not, assuredly, by the oligarchs. It must be therefore, of necessity, by the people. In fact, the oligarchies fell in Greece as in ancient Rome, and mediæval Italy, and all the world over, by their own dissensions. United, an aristocracy would rule society forever; but united it never has been, save when too late or in opposition. A factious member, through ambition or for vengeance, calls in the multitude, who, with the concert of some old adherents, invest him singly with the government. Then, to gratify the needy appetites and passions of his constituents, of course the tyrant must attack the properties and persons of the oligarchy. This will soon, with their old rivalry and new jealousy, unite the latter to subvert the government—unite not only among themselves, but with the people: for the people, thus inducted into a knowledge of their force—at an epoch too when force is the acknowledged test of right—must be dealt with on terms of equality. Thus naturally, necessarily, spontaneously should have arisen what the record of Hellenic history assures us did in fact succeed—the establishment of the democracy, and the development of the agora into the sovereign assembly of the nation.

M. Sudre next proceeds to an analysis of the Hellenic institutions considered generally. Three considerations are selected to characterize them: the extent of the city or state; the organization of the inhabitants; the political constitution and its principle of sovereignty.

1. The Greek conception of a state was a fortified city, surrounded with sufficient territory to subsist the population. To live in scattered hamlets was considered a mark of barbarism; no doubt a lurking reminiscence of the state abandoned by the Greeks themselves upon the establishment of the heroic cities. This conjecture is confirmed by Thucydides traditionally, and the fact survived long after among the border states of Greece, the Locrians, the Ætolians, the Acarnanians, &c., who were always viewed as freebooters and barbarians. So that the Greeks of the primeval ages passed through essentially the same condition in which we find the English Saxon and the German Teuton of the middle ages, with that well-known barbarous aversion to have even their houses joined together, which our intelligent historians call their "love of independence." And this aversion explains in turn a fact apparently at variance with the like normality which we contend for in the opposite sentiment of civilized Greece. In France and Italy, which were assuredly more

civilized in even the dark ages than the Greek cities of the heroic epoch in question, the prejudice might seem to have been, on the contrary, against the cities; perhaps the word *villain* came not from *vilis*, but meant the resident of a town, (*ville*,) somewhat as villager (*paganus*) came to imply religious opprobrium. The explanation is, that both the sentiment and term belonged alone to the barbarians just alluded to, from the North, who, then controlling the South of Europe, left the designation in the laws, whence it has passed into its actual acceptation. Thus the Hellenic connexion of life in cities with civilization and *vice versa* is nothing peculiar, as M. Sudre seems to intimate.

Another circumstance which he adverts to would much more justify the supposition. The Greeks, he tells us, were of the opinion (a mere corollary of the preceding) that the concentration of several villages within the walls of a single city was the certain sign of an advance in civilization. And yet, adds he, the concentration of their several "cities" into one state they would have regarded as a relapse to Asiatic barbarism. The inconsistency is doubtless curious, but it is as universal as human nature. The Greeks appreciated rightly the direction of social progress, so far as guided by their national experience; nor are they censurable any more for not perceiving beyond their mental, than if it were their geographical, horizon. Their fault of logic lay in concluding that nothing *was* beyond it, and that their position embraced the limits of the empyrean. But this is constantly committed by every nation of the globe, who all, save one, however, must moreover be less excusable than were the Greeks. The Greeks at that time held undoubtedly the foremost position of human progress, and so were destitute of all correctives by comparison. In the diversity of modern states, the foremost only (whichever it be) might plead a similar extenuation of the universal self-conceit. Yet each alike conceives itself to hold, not merely this present leadership, but even the goal of civilizable perfectibility. For example, we Americans, if not entirely the first in title, are very certainly among the first in this pretension, while even the Russians characterize us as a horde of traders without anything of governmental organization. What our conception is of Russia it is not necessary to recite; whereas her own is, that she is, in turn, the very paragon of sociality. On the other hand, the two countries are found as confidently of one mind in regarding "French centralization" as the certain index of decay—the decay of decrepitude, however, says one; of despotism, cries the other.

Amid this conflict of pretensions, the only course is to discard as valueless all estimations of themselves or rivals, as well by nations

as individuals. They are incompetent not merely morally, but psychologically. Nations are the constituent links of the extended chain of social progress, and no such link could, with the eyes of Argus, observe the chain of which it makes a part. The thing is possible only to the intellect, and from an abstract and extraneous position, which can alone unfold the bearings and the graduation of the social march. This position yields the philosophy of history as sketched above. It shows the march to have been constantly in the line of centralization. The Greek opinion which has occasioned this discussion is a proof of fact, as far, at least, as the degree of community called the "city." Nay, despite the prepossession toward this combination as considered final, the actual movement went a good deal further in Greek history. The federation of the Amphictyons is noted as an instance. But founded merely, like all primordial associations, on the religious principle, it could not push the concentration to a civic fusion of the allied cities. This step was also accomplished finally, but by the military power—the power that always, to the exclusion of the sacerdotal, ruled in Greece; and Hellas became a nation in the monarchy of the Macedonians.

But what! exclaims some startled democrat, could monarchy be a progress upon the glorious republic of Athens? Yes, there can be, on the contrary, not the least scientific doubt of it! Otherwise, we may be certain that the higher union had not occurred. Those who recognise established facts to be the only ground of science, admit their *orderly* necessity and progress: science could not be certain, that is, could not be science, where there was even a possibility of accident. Moreover, the advance is very manifest to observation, in spite of the absurdities of writers on the subject. The vulgar doctrine of historians holds the Macedonian conquest to be the cause of the extinction of Hellenic civilization. On the contrary, it was, in our opinion, but the consequence and consummation of the civilization. There was, in truth, no real extinction in the case, but a transformation: no other destruction than that resulting from diffusion. This diffusion prepared the world for the reception of Christianity, which even its opponents owned to have promoted civilization. But the diffusion could not have been effected had the states of Greece maintained their independence; for, instead of foreign expeditions, their power was wasted in mutual massacre. Organic unity is essential to great external operations, while severalty suits internal elaboration. Both are equally constituent elements of progress, and prevail by turns. The turn of centralization had now arrived in the Greek cities, after fifteen centuries of civilizing agitation, and this accumulated culture must

find a medium of convergence for its energetic propagation into wider scenes. Such a medium was supplied accordingly, at the nick of time, in its three-fold organ, corresponding with the three great systems of the social body. The same century gave birth to Socrates, to Alexander, and to Aristotle: Socrates, the *moral* organ, to supplant the *fact* of force and birth, by the *abstraction* of will or conscience in civil government, and to originate a school of doctrine for the exposition of this new principle; Alexander, the *physical* organ, to prepare this school a central city, and to throw open with the sword (the only argument they could appreciate) the fairest countries of the ancient East to the tongue and teachings of Greek philosophy; Aristotle, the *intellectual* organ, destined likewise to pursue the task, but in the opposite direction of the future and the West, and with the corresponding agencies of dialectics and dawning science.

2. The municipal organization of the Greek cities was various, but the following classification was general: slaves or serfs of the soil, free subjects, and citizens. The slaves were either barbarians, that is foreigners, or of Greek origin, the latter being prisoners of war or paupers forced to sell themselves and families. The slave class, in proportion, was commonly large, making at Athens four-fifths of the population, and including not only domestic servants, but the working people generally, and even mechanics and traders. This composition of the most republican by far of the Greek republics should serve to rectify the schoolboy notions about Greek democracy. In truth, the "demos," at the wildest moment in which Aristophanes besmeared his picture, was a veritable conclave of aristocrats. And hence, no doubt, the brilliancy, in arts and letters, of the Athenians; from whom we, therefore, should not argue to the modern notion of democracy. The serfs, who also, we may observe, have been mistakenly imagined to be peculiar to more modern ages, had been marked more deeply in the Greek republics. They were found, however, chiefly in the agricultural communities, as in Sparta the Helots, in Thessaly the Penestæ, in Crete the Periœci. In fact, the serf is, in legal language, an "immovable" slave, as slavery is a "movable" serfdom. The second class, or free subjects, were resident foreigners and freed bondsmen, and were invested with civil and religious, but not with political, rights. The latter appertained alone to the third or ruling class, the citizens.

It would be easy to point out, between the terms of this social series, a strictly equable gradation, which the three stages express but summarily, if the process did not need a length of explanation quite inadmissible. Collaterally, too, there would be found a cor-

respondence between the classes in the aggregate and their real prototypes of the caste system; the order only—of power or precedence—and the intensity are duly modified. But we must hasten to an observation of M. Sudre upon Greek history, which yields the promised opportunity of throwing some light upon the caste formation.

Speaking (page 109) of the heroic and Homeric ages, he remarks that labour and mechanical skill were held in high consideration. Vulcan was a god, and Homer sings with honour of the fabricator of the armour of Ajax and the carpenter who built the (log?) mansion of Paris. The hero kings themselves excelled in some industrial art, as Ulysses did in ship-building and ploughing a furrow exactly straight, and as Peter the Great and the Chinese emperors did and do to our own times.

> "But when the heroic monarchies were overthrown by the oligarchies of the nobles, a part of the freemen not noble emerged to wealth and aspired to power. On the other hand, the larger portion, consisting of artisans and labourers, underwent a correlative fall, and sunk, through usury, into servitude. Thereupon industrial labour became a servile occupation, and deep disdain succeeded the esteem of which it had been theretofore the object. Thus, while on the one side there was a gradual extension of the number of citizens admitted to political privileges, on the other there was an equally progressive restriction of that of persons enjoying the benefits of bare liberty."

Now, this double operation of the economic evolution, thus depositing successive strata toward the two extremes of the social scale, is that which likewise gave spontaneous origin and ordination to the mystic castes. The difference between the cases lies in the matter, not in the manner. The *matter* of the primitive man was completely inert, so to speak, unorganized, degraded mentally through his superstitions, as well as physically through his appetites; he therefore rested wherever deposited with cloddish order and local eternity. But in the emigrant and thus emancipated founders of the Greek states, the mind at least was fast escaping from the reign of force and fear. Hence the option, the variation, the irregularity of the "classes," which might be called conglomerate strata comparatively with the castes, although resulting from the same organic operation. And hence, in fine, the substitution of the moral principle in government.

3. We are thus conveyed quite naturally to the author's third criterion, the principle and forms of the Greek constitutions. But as the general succession of these forms has been sketched already and the particular details must be not unfamiliar to the reader, we will hasten from the author's survey of the *institutions* to that of *systems*, which will more properly comprise the principle of sovereignty.

On account, however, of the universal interest of the subject, and the suggestiveness of the analogy with our own governmental situation, we must transcribe the author's sketch of the democracy of Athens; yet a *democracy* of but one-fifth of the population:—

> "All the legislative, executive, and judicial functions are passed into the hands of the people, who execute them either directly in the general assembly, or indirectly by committees of that body. No distinction of birth or fortune is recognised by the laws. The vote of the lowest labourer has the same value in the *ecclesia* as that of the most rich and noble of the patricians. All the citizens are alike admissible to all the offices of the republic, on condition of proving capacity and morality; and most of the places are, moreover, portioned among the candidates, thus tried, by lot. They are all salaried, down to the simple attendants at the general assembly. The terms of tenure are all short, never more than one year, in some cases not exceeding a single day. . . . ."—P. 172.

Besides the equality of vote, the election by lot, and the universalization of salary, the author adds:—

> "A characteristic feature of the constitution is the vast extension of the attributions of the judicial power, which, indeed, is confounded largely with the legislative. What is no less remarkable is to observe this people, while it delegates the law-making to a special tribunal, retain itself the executive functions, the direction of foreign politics, the arbitrament of peace and war, of finance and public works; in a word, reserve to the general assembly the particular cases, and to the particular assembly the general cases."—P. 172.

The absorption, by the judicial, of the legislative functions, is but a remnant of the primitive character of all governments, which must, as we have seen, begin by the administration of justice. In the antithesis of M. Sudre about the general assembly, the inversion is but apparent, the real order is entirely natural. In conduct as in conception, the people, and indeed its betters, can reach the general and the abstract only through the particular and the concrete. Human nature has eyes and appetites for many ages before it has an intellect. It thus appreciates a salaried office or desires an *active* and *immediate* influence, long before it cares a button for the sublime symbol called the law. And in this, as well as most the other points, we see how little it has altered from the Athenian to the American democracy.

Instead of seeing, however, these necessities of nature in the Athenians, M. Sudre sets to excusing them, in the common way, by imputing the excesses of the democracy to the oligarchy, its selfishness, its cruelty, its lack of patriotism. The Athenian oligarchy had, like all others, its faults, no doubt. Yet its selfishness was but the common tenacity to what the laws declared its own; its cruelty arose from its insufficient and therefore desperate means of holding its power; its lack of patriotism, in inviting for-

eigners to come to aid it, was but a mode of saving what it deemed the country as well as its caste. Democracy has the same vices, only (from the nature of its composition, which is a final amalgamation of all *internal* antagonisms) their operation is overlooked, because thus necessarily exterior. Are not democracies, in fact, notorious for all these vices in their foreign policy—for selfishness, for cruelty, for want of the higher patriotism of devotion to international and intellectual civilization? For example, when this civilization is menaced seriously, at the present moment, by a new incursion from the "northern hive," with a despot robber to conduct the swarm, which, we ask, of all the governments, has foreborne to stigmatize the outrage, and even cherishes a secret sympathy or a selfish amity with the offender? Why, our own most perfect of all possible democracies. For want of colonies to realize the proverbial cruelty of republics, are not a seventh of our population exposed, by law, to worse brutalities than those denounced in monarchical countries, by laws against "cruelty to animals?" And as to selfishness and its twin offspring of "annexation" and unscrupulousness, are we not deemed *facile princeps*, not excepting Nicholas himself?

Interiorly, the vices of democracy are dissembled also in another manner. The people appear less selfish, because they have less to sacrifice; more patriotic, because the country is *their* caste; in fine, more clement because less considerate and more impulsive. Yet, after admitting the extenuation of this double series of disguises, was not the democracy of even Athens still more infamous than the patricians for rapacity, for cruelty, for ingratitude and injustice, as well as for outrage upon foreign countries and the destruction of its own? Did it not wantonly provoke the fatal Peloponnesian war, and the still more foolish Sicilian expedition? Did it not rifle the public treasury and even ruin the financial system to make the offices it seized and multiplied all salaried? When this had failed did it not confiscate the private property of its fellow-citizens, and oppress the independent cities which it had "annexed" under name of allies with the most unscrupulous extortion and even plunder? Who can forget its congenial deference to the unprincipled buffoon Cleon, and its reckless disregard of the patriot eloquence of Demosthenes; its giddy exiles and recalls of the clever profligate Alcibiades? Who can forget the greedy fine and the deadly prison of the conqueror at Marathon: the ostracism of Themistocles, of Cimon, of Aristides; the hemlock of Socrates and of Phocion? Can most of these crimes be even pretended to have been provoked by the aristocracy?

Thus, it were easy to retaliate the imputation of M. Sudre, who looks, as usual, too much at Athens through the modern medium of domestic politics, and being a *fautor* of the French *bourgeoisie*, defends the "demos" whom he deems its analogue. But such reciprocal recriminations would be unjust on both sides, and most of the charges are susceptible of explanation or extenuation. Not, however, by the mere statistical or pedagogical manipulations, pro or con, employed by Mitford or by Grote. The right excuse is to be found, not in evading the facts, but in exposing their motives and results. For instance, democracy is rapacious because relatively needy; it is reckless and unprincipled because comparatively ignorant; it is cruel because its conscience is dispersed among a greater multitude, and because its task is less defensive than aggressive; it is ungrateful because suspicious of intellectual superiority, and thus suspicious from a timid instinct of its own incompetency. These very natural infirmities provoked the faults of the oligarchy quite as really as the oligarchical excesses did the democratic. But the joint result was, in Greece, the beneficial suppression of the *city* constitution by that of the state, and the corresponding evolution of the moral principle of sovereignty.

From this survey of the historical institutions of ancient Greece, the author passes to the speculative systems.

The earliest theoretic essay upon government or politics of which we have any knowledge is of the date of the fifth century before Christ. The constitutions of the primitive lawgivers were religious and moral, or, rather, they were mere maxims, such as the sayings of the Seven Sages. Even codes of riper date and much more system and celebrity—as those of Draco, Zeleucus, Chorandus, &c. —advanced no further than merely civil and especially penal institutions. They said nothing of *political* organization. And this analysis of history conforms strictly, we see, to theory.

Again, the theory requires no less that speculation upon politics be first applied, not to the principle, but to the *form* of the constitution. It is thus that in the art of medicine, which is the politics of the "body corporal," we see the culture of anatomy precede, by ages, that of physiology. In fact, the object of anatomy is quite accessible to sense, is consistent in all its parts, and extended obviously in space, and the question is to ascertain its laws of *state*. The subject-matter of physiology is, on the contrary, a pure abstraction, whose parts exist but in succession, and of which the object is the laws of *change*. The conception of the latter, then, requires a vastly riper intellect; and the proportion is even augmented in the physiology of the social system. This is

also why the form, the *anatomy* of government is the preëminent consideration with the people at the present day; who do not know that the *same principle* (as even our author observes, empirically) may well assume, and does, in fact, assume the various forms. But what the people or the lowest intellectual class must do at present, the highest must have been subject to originally. And accordingly the first political discussion found in Greek literature—we mean the famous and fictitious conference of the Persian satraps in Herodotus—concerns the preference between monarchy, aristocracy, and democracy. We say fictitious, for all three of the forms could scarcely at that time have been known in Persia, and very certainly not criticized with the mature sagacity of the Greek historian. Most probably Herodotus took this agreeable mode of canvassing opinions current among the learned of his countrymen.

Accordingly, toward the same period appeared Hippodamus, of Miletus, who, says Aristotle, was the first speculative writer upon government. His work is known, indeed, only through the envious or carping criticism of the Stagirite, and from a short abstract preserved most fortunately by Stobæus. From this, it seems, that Hippodamus not only conceived in theory the different forms discussed by Herodotus, but prescribed the famous modern mixture of the three as the best government. But he went deeper than those outward forms, and analyzed the social system with a profundity not attained generally to this day. It is the advance of the anatomy of Morgagni upon that of Galen.

> "Society, thought Hippodamus, consists of *three* essential classes. The first comprises the men of *mind*, who have in charge the general interests; the second, the men of *muscle*, whose part it is to defend the country; the third, the men of *labour*, who supply society with its subsistence. They are called the deliberative, the military, and the industrial orders. The deliberative is the highest in dignity; the industrial the lowest. Each of these three bodies is subdivided into *three* portions. Thus the deliberative order is composed of a preparatory commission, a senate, an executive authority. The military order consists of a body of officers, a regular army, and the mass of the able-bodied—in modern language, the staff, the line, the reserve or militia. In fine, the labouring class is portioned into agriculturists, artisans, and merchants. Such are, says Hippodamus, the *essential elements of all societies*. The problem of civil government is to devise a method whereby these elements shall work harmoniously together.
>
> "This consummation can be but the result of *three* fundamental influences, namely, doctrines and creeds, manners and tastes, customs and laws. The first controls and corrects the passions and directs them in the ways of virtue: the second, which, from its constant action, is a second nature, shapes the character; the laws serve either to deter from evil by operating upon fear, or to stimulate to good by the lure of recompense. In fine, these three great social forces have a *triple* object to correspond: the realization of the honourable, the just, and the useful. Or in cases where the three acquisitions could not be all combined, the preference should be given in the order of the statement."—Pp. 227, 228.

M. Sudre, in this analysis of the abstract of Stobæus, goes on to detail various precepts of Hippodamus on the latter head, which, while all admirable for the same sagacity, are less essential to the point in hand. We will conclude, then, with concurring heartily with M. Sudre in the observation that "the enumeration, made by the Milesian philosopher, of the classes or essential functions of every human association, is more just, more comprehensive, and more complete than most of its successors; and that Plato and Aristotle, and even the modern political economists, (who work exclusively upon the third and lowest of the three orders,) have never equalled it." In fact, the Stagirite, who would be rightly considered likeliest to have surpassed it, has reprehended, among various other things, the definition of Hippodamus, for including labourers (as it had done, and perhaps even the slaves) in the body politic; whereas he himself proscribed the labourers as well as slaves, and even the artisans. The difference is, that Aristotle includes the government alone, gives the anatomy but of the head and of the arms; while Hippodamus comprises also the essential system of nutrition. There is, moreover, a degree of truth in the distinction of M. Sudre, that Hippodamus divides society into different classes of *functions*, rather than classes of *persons*, as does Aristotle. But the division was in reality not *of* the functions but *by* them. The functions were employed in this case but as a general expression or the exponent of the social organography. Indeed, they could not have been conceived objectively and as a basis of analysis until the principles of governmental physiology were developed; but even the existence of such principles had not been broached until some time after in the discussion which has given Socrates a duly special immortality. But before passing to this great era, we must show more of Hippodamus, who, although so worthily its real forerunner, is almost unknown in political history. "The constitution of a state," says this fine observer, "will be truly solid if it be mixed, that is, composed of the choicest governmental forms. I must be understood to speak only of the forms that are natural, and not of forms that are contrary to nature. For instance, tyranny and oligarchy are incompatible with a free state. The ingredients to be introduced then, are, first royalty, then aristocracy. Royalty is a sort of imitation of the divine order, and can on this account be kept with difficulty pure in mortal hands without degenerating into luxury and insolence. It should therefore be admitted only in limits useful to the public weal. Still more requisite in the state is the aristocratic principle, for it procures not one but many chiefs inspired with lofty emulation, who yield a range of choice

and change in the depositories of the government. Democracy is also of absolute necessity. In fact, each member of the society should share its honours and its advantages. But too much influence must not be accorded to the vulgar, because they are presumptuous, inconsiderate, and ignorant."

Who does not fancy, cries M. Sudre, after citing this passage in his author's terms, that he has been reading an actual portrait of the British constitution? Hippodamus then is the originator, and not Cicero or Tacitus, of the conception of a mixed or balanced constitution. But he erred—and indeed the error remains universal to our own day—in supposing that such a mixture must be artificial and exceptional. All three forms are integral elements of every possible constitution, as Hippodamus should have concluded from his own analysis above exhibited. But he was really not aware, any more than still is M. Sudre, of the fundamental reason of his trinary divisions, nor that they rested on the same triplicity of every human organism, as well collective as individual, from which also emanate the three governments. In fact, it is not the exclusive presence but the relative predominance of one or other of these conjunct forms that gives a government its designation. Thus, our own, in which the democratic element floats fully uppermost, is called, according to the general usage, a democracy; while yet the President wields a far larger share of royal power than Queen Victoria. The same unconsciousness of his own principles it was that also led Hippodamus to consider tyranny and oligarchy as "unnatural." They are forms quite as *natural* and even as necessary as the others; they are only noxious as *degenerations* from the main proportionals of the progression, which, from the human point of view, are deemed exclusively legitimate. Like ochlocracy or pure democracy, they are as normal as old age, which from the point of view of nature is a prerequisite of renovation. In fine, this oversight of principles so much in keeping with the remote epoch, would seem to show that the unrivalled outline, above transcribed, of the social system must have been due in part to an artistical divination of organic symmetry, as the poet Goethe was the first to seize the botanical theory of development.

Accordingly, Hippodamus was by profession an architect, and was the builder of the Piræus and of the city of Rhodes. He was the first, too, to propose the plan of laying off cities in regular streets, instead of having the houses huddled without any order, as they had been hitherto. This should, surely, to a philosopher of less sagacity than Aristotle, have afforded presumption of a capacity for also recognising *social* order. He who loves order in one direction

pursues it usually in all. Yet Aristotle, on the contrary, makes sneering mention of the profession, as if unfitting Hippodamus to write on government. The probable envy at his success, which seems inferable from such a criticism, is still more shabbily suggested by certain strictures on his foppish dress. In the first place, Aristotle was himself quite finical in this respect, though, perhaps, chiefly to supply a particular penury of nature. But, in principle, the trait in question was not inconsonant with both philosophers. It is the charlatans who affect slovenliness as a symptom of deep thought, and whom, on visiting their study, you will find immersed in a chaos of books. They know that the vulgar, whom alone they look to, take eccentricity for greatness, and admire exterior self-denial, of which they feel themselves incapable. This, in fact, is the philosophy of the monastic filth of all religions. And whenever it is not affected, it betokens mental imbecility. Disorder of ideas is akin to disorder of exterior. Whereas a clearly comprehensive and methodical intelligence must needs be *simplex munditiis* as well in bodily as mental apparel. No more conclusive (except, again, to quite the contrary of Aristotle's intention) is another stricture of his on Hippodamus, as "affecting to know all things;" the inference suggested being, of course, the vulgar one that he knew nothing. Such an argument comes ill from Aristotle, who himself wrote books upon almost all things—except precisely what he knew professionally—and, morever, the abstract truth is, that he wrote so well, like Hippodamus, for the very reason of this generality of his acquirements. For to write thoughtfully on anything, we must know something of all things. Your *hommes spécials* are only good for making school-books: for here the Helicon of inspiration is not reflection but authority, and the object is to inculcate, not to explain. That Aristotle did not recognise these things betrays, at least in this particular, the disposition toward his predecessors which is imputed to him by Lord Bacon, of being unwilling, "like the Turk," to bear a brother near the throne.

The lineal successor of Hippodamus in the march of governmental speculation, is, as has been said already, Socrates and his school. As to the views of the sage himself, they can be known only indirectly, through either the Dialogues of Plato or the Memorabilia of Xenophon. On the subject of the sovereignty, M. Sudre describes him, justly, as sometimes making it the heritage of capacity or genius, and concluding for the despotism of an individual; sometimes, also, as recognising in the general will the rightful source of all authority and law; and anon affirming the existence of laws superior to the will of man and of a justice whereof the origin is

neither in number nor in genius. (P. 249.) And he remarks that these hesitations ought not to surprise us. "They are," says he, "explained by the immense difficulty of the problem, which has in all times been one of the shoals of the human mind."

No, they are not at all *explained*, though they may be excused by such a reason. The explanation is a good deal deeper than even Socrates's observation of the historical fluctuations of government. It was suggested in our indication of the three successive grounds of society and of the position assigned to Socrates as destined organ of the second principle. This middle position implies already a double tendency to variation, and, more especially, a hesitation in him who took it for the first time. But the conformity of our theory to the historic traits of Socrates will be more striking if we remember the special nature of the position. We have described it, in fact, already, as the transition of the source of sovereignty from the divine basis of power or force to the human basis of right or will. Now the innovator in the source or *principle* would attend little to the point of *form;* which shows why Socrates was so indifferent about the form of the government as to prefer a despotism, which imports the absence of any at all. Then, again, the gifted *genius* who was, according to Socrates, to exercise this despotism, is a mysterious *mezzo termine* between divinity and man, and thus correlative to the transition of the principle. The new principle of will itself explains directly the second sentiment above recorded of the Attic sage, as placing sovereignty in the "general will." And the third doctrine, which again transfers it to some still ulterior but unknown source, is still more broadly characteristic of the situation.

Socrates, in fact, in breaking from the ancient principle of government, provoked the sophists, who have become infamous only for being champions of that odious doctrine. But he was forced to take, in battering the principle of force, a principle no less untenable itself at bottom—the principle which, in its consequences, is in turn become as odious in the metaphysicians and the Jesuits, those kindred sophists of the moral epoch. Socrates was then, in principle, no less a sophist than his malignant adversaries, as was warrantably charged accordingly by his accusers. And if this fundamental fallacy could have escaped his own sagacity, his acute combatants were fully competent to make him sensible of the weak side. From one or both of these sources, he was certainly aware of it. And this, moreover, (with the explanatory versatility of the true theory,) accounts precisely for two additional peculiarities of Socrates. One of these was the famous axiom, that certain knowledge is impossible; which is the dictate of chagrined despair in a

mind that, severed from the general anchorage, is forced to recognise, in turn, the instability of its new doctrine. The other was the dialectical procedure of Socrates, which was so peculiar to him as to still retain his name. Consisting, it is known, in never avowing his principle or affirming anything, and but reducing to absurdity the positions of his opponents, it was just the system for a man too honest to aver a principle he felt unsound, and too intelligent not to perceive his destitution in this particular. It may be added that the *negative* reasoning, which was the consequence of such conviction, is a third characteristic of the moral epoch proclaimed by Socrates, the epoch of free volition, of destruction, of metaphysics. But with his knowledge of this inanity of the moral principle, the "general will," both as a test of truth in general, and as a source of political sovereignty, combined with also the deep persuasion that such test and sanction must have existence; it was but natural for Socrates to have recourse to the third conjecture, of referring vaguely to "laws superior to the will of man" and the light of genius, as in fact recorded in the above abstract of his vacillations. This negative glimmer of the final principle of social sovereignty, which is reason, (λόγος,) is, in fine, moreover, the "unknown God," so often hinted by the same philosopher. Ages after, St. John makes this λόγος the appellative of the divinity, as the original archetype as well as architect of all things.

Here, then, is a fundamental explanation of the variations and definition of the innovations of Socrates. And the same principles would guide us equally through the derivative peculiarities which M. Sudre leaves as unaccounted for in the disciples of the sage. We need consequently offer but a few remarks upon his able survey of the three principal disciples, (though the last be such but indirectly,) namely, Xenophon, Plato, and Aristotle.

A first reflection is the strict coincidence between the tenets of these three writers and the foregoing phases of the doctrine of the master. Xenophon is the representative of the "sovereignty of genius." It is the theme of his Utopian Cyropædia. Beyond this, he was, in politics, but a mere statesman, not a philosopher, with expediency for his sole principle and with success for his sufficient sanction. In this he also echoes the scepticism of the master, and in prescribing it in practice, was a gentle prototype of Machiavel. Superior in point of intellect as well as posterior in point of time, the famous founder of the Academy espoused, conformably to both advantages, the middle stage of the Socratic evolution, the moral principle; and hence we find him the continuator of the normal mission of the master. While Aristotle, advancing higher in

the double order of time and intellect, evolves, accordingly, the final views, or rather aspirations, of Socrates toward a criterion of truth and sovereignty independent of will and genius, and lying exclusively in the recognition of the natural laws of the social system. So nicely congruous are the counter tissues of philosophy and history, where even thinkers can still discern but simple accident and chaos!

In the next place, we are to note the points of progress, in social science, of the two latter of these philosophers, beyond the position of Socrates.

Plato is, throughout his writings, in reality, what he professed to be, the mere expositor of the ideas of his master. He is presented, by all his Dialogues, in the personage of Socrates, as maintaining the theme of justice against the rival principle of force or fraud. And what is curious, although quite natural, he states the arguments of his antagonists with more ability and even eloquence than those that favour his own side. The explanation of this strange procedure is now supplied in the foregoing pages: the side of Plato as of Socrates was the *dawning* principle of will or conscience, for which the arguments were unexplored, and of which the advantages were undeveloped; whereas the interests derivable from fraud and force were long familiar, and all the sophisms that could enforce them had become eloquent common-places in the schools. In the one case Plato had but to borrow; in the other he must discover. M. Sudre, who sees nothing of this however, rates him roughly for the maladroitness:—

> "He should have laid down with authority the great metaphysical principle of moral obligation, established that the idea of right and duty is resolvable into no other, explained and justified it by the mere fact of its existence in the human conscience, evinced that it controls reason itself, &c. Instead of following a course thus truly philosophic and becoming the subject, the oracle of the Academy launches off into subtle distinctions, &c."—P. 280.

Alas! for the "truly philosophic" recipe of our author, of whose philosophy and criticism this one passage would show the competency. In the first place, he puts Plato completely upon his own position in relation to the idea of conscience or of right; and this naive sentiment betrays a curious, but, in truth, the common preparation for the comprehension of the deeds and doctrines of a remote epoch. Whereas, in fact, as we have seen, the age and even the intellect of Plato had but a dawning and disputed glimmer of those abstract notions; and this precisely is why he failed to go directly to the subject, and was led to "launch off into subtle distinctions," as people always do when out at sea. But, again, besides

this gross oversight of all historical psychology, let us consider what it would avail if Plato could have done as thus prescribed him, and if he had laid down, in fact, that "great metaphysical principle" which is its own sufficient evidence and "controls reason itself." Would not even the most thick-headed of the sophists have responded: "Very well; you hold that conscience is the only source of all authority and justice, a source, moreover, self-demonstrative and incontestable by argument. How, then, can you pretend to question the established right of the bloodiest tyrant who merely deigns to plead *his* conscience in reply? You will not venture upon the subterfuge of saying such conscience does not *exist;* for it is the essence of the notion, as you yourself, indeed, declare to be cognoscible only by its professed owner. Will you call it, then, a *false* conscience? But the mere assertion, not to say the proof, that anything is false or true implies appeal to the test of reason, which you have repudiated in this subject. So that you see your new criterion, taken just as you present it, is the very sanction for all despotical and oligarchical oppressions; instead of being, as you imagined, with your habitual fantastic easiness, the heaven-sent subverter of them all!"

And, in truth, not all the logic of the Socratic school together could find escape, we dare affirm, from this overwhelming retort. Nor is it merely in point of argument that the conclusion would be irreproachable; it is abundantly confirmed by experience. To mention here but a single instance: Was it not conscience—sincere conscience—that authorized as well as erected the "devilish enginery" of the Inquisition—of that institution whose atrocious tortures are become the symbol, as they were the epitome, of all the tyrannies and all the iniquities of history? The only outlet, then, from this predicament, which M. Sudre would prescribe to Plato, is through rejection of the vicious premises, the common notion of the use of conscience, as applied to political action. Conscience, in its political use, is *not* the principle of justice, but of revolt. If it were the principle of *justice*, it must be *equally* accessible to the appeal of both the parties, the oppressors and the oppressed. But the consequence of this would be, as has been shown in the case of conscience, to make justice also self-contradictory—which will be seen, no doubt, to be absurd. That conscience is but a principle or an expedient of *revolt* is proved directly by the constant part which it has played in history. It was by conscience, in the rudimental shape of "genius," "moral sentiment," &c., that the Socratic school assailed and sapped the tyrannies of *physical* force. It was by conscience, under the maturer designation of "private

judgment," that the Reformation overthrew the tyrannies of *spiritual* force. It is by conscience, in the disguise of the "inherent rights of man," that democracy is getting rid of the *political* force of the feudal system. Conscience then, through all these subtleties of transformation, is a mere instrument, and even an instrument permissible only to the side of insurrection. But as this continues still to be the side of the great majority—whose mental calibre can scarce, moreover, extend, in anything, to *both* sides—the negative rallying word of conscience is supposed to be a positive and general principle. It has, however, by those very properties, been the great agent of the revolution that is superseding the reign of force in preparation for the reign of reason—which alone will have the divine prerogative of being impartial and universal.

But the point we were to note of Plato is one in which he makes a clear advance beyond the elements inherited from Socrates and Hippodamus. This fresh accession to social science is called his Theory of Revolutions. Not that, as promulgated by the author, it is of scientific accuracy, but that it was the first conception of a *dynamic* law of society. In Plato's notion, the revolution of societies describes a circle, passing regularly through the following forms of government: patriarchy, monarchy, aristocracy, timocracy, ploutocracy, oligarchy, and democracy, which begets tyranny; then the cycle is complete, and the state must perish or be regenerated. Plato further explains the movement by some mathematical considerations, which are, however, unintelligible to the commentators. At the same time, seeing that Aristotle must have understood them perfectly—since he admits, while criticising the assigned *order* of his master's series, that there may indeed be truth in his *explanation*—in view of this the latest translators, Cousin and Schleiermacher, justly refrain from pronouncing upon either the theory or the expression, and suggest that our difficulty may be ignorance of the Greek meaning of the technical terms. We shall imitate their abstinence as to the principle of the movement. Its *circularity* has been refuted by the theory above submitted, which shows that on a diversity of principles the cycles are progressive. But Plato's greatest error was the oversight of all *progress;* for he considered, on the contrary, the entire movement a *degeneration.* This utter inversion of the truth (which was, however, an exact deduction from the ancient or *à priori* point of view) supplied occasion, in its correction, for the next advance in social science, which was the matchless contribution of Aristotle.

The philosophy of Aristotle, as well general as social, presents, in fact, a complete contrast to Plato's by proceeding *à posteriori.* This

is its distinction and its glory. But this, it may be said, was an improvement in mere method. Yes, and so are all improvements that have advanced largely the human mind, from the time of Socrates down. The *principles* to be discovered are in reality few and simple; it is the *methods* of detecting and applying them that are prolific. Hence, accordingly, that singular profundity of Aristotle, which filled his writings with views and processes not even yet reached by the march of science. We have only space to mention one or two on the theme before us. Thus, in commencing his comparative analysis with a division of governments into *three* kinds, he adds, "The thing is not conformable to rigorous reality, for the number of combinations is infinite." But he did not see that it was precisely this *infinitude* of the series that rendered normal the trial division which, like Hippodamus, he divined empirically. Again, in criticising Plato on the Theory of Revolutions, he observes the fundamental cause of all political revolutions to be *excess of inequality or of equality.* What profundity and justness! But how did he not remark, then, that the cause of all stability must, even by the rule of contraries, which he employs on this very occasion, be a regular gradation of social rank between the two extremes? He did, however, recognise, although confusedly, the fact itself, in recommending as the best of governments an aristocracy of merit. What he saw not was, that the preëminence and the stability of this medium form proceeds ulteriorly from the *hierarchical* organization of entire nature. It was the laws of this procession, no doubt, that Plato sought to formulize, in their reaction of revolutions, mathematically. Thus the theory of Aristotle was less fundamental than that of Plato; but, by compensation, it was more *specific*, as being more proximate. And this, in fact, is the direction of the march of scientific progress, which Aristotle pushes further in this explication of his own axioms. "In every state the citizens are all *equal* in certain aspects, *unequal* in other points of view. Demagogy [by which the ancients understood what moderns call democracy] springs almost always from the pretension to render absolute and universal an equality which exists really but in *some* respects; oligarchy, from the pretension to render absolute and universal an inequality that exists really but in certain points." The due development of this remark would yield a precious treatise on practical politics. But the intention of the foregoing pages has been accomplished in having deduced it, through the filiation of progressive systems, as the utmost landmark left by Greek intellect.

The Roman governments are next surveyed by M. Sudre, with the same ability—that is to say, considered from the ordinary point

of view. But this scholastic view may also, in Roman history, be now corrected—at least to all who have read as carefully—in a single line. The destination of the Roman people was to propagate *in practice* the moral *principle* evolved by Socrates and authorized by Christianity. The result was the sole *creation* of that merely imitative nation—the immortal system of the Roman jurisprudence.

ART. IV.—THE ROMAN CATHOLIC PRESS.

THAT the power of Romanism has grown since the beginning of the present century is an indubitable fact. The history of the Papacy has for centuries been an alternation of periods of advance and retreat; we are now in the midst of one of its forward movements, to be followed, as usual, by a still greater step backward. Amid all vicissitudes, however, the aims of Rome remain the same; and, under whatsoever guise presented, they are always inconsistent, fundamentally, with general liberty, whether religious or political.

The Roman Church has achieved her conquests, in every age, by using means adapted to the time; nay, even by turning the weapons of her enemies against themselves. So, at the present time, in countries where the press is the great power, both moral and political, Rome finds herself compelled, in spite of the essential antagonism between her system and the spread of general knowledge, in spite of her own repeated anathemas against books, newspapers, and printing in general, for the *people*, to make use of that very press to further her own ends. She handles the uncongenial weapon awkwardly enough, it is true; but that she handles it at all is one of the most pregnant characteristics of the age. It is our intention in this paper to give a brief survey of the principal periodical journals now published in this country in the interest of Rome. But before we proceed to details, a few remarks upon the *status* of journalists in the Roman Catholic Church itself will not be out of place.

The first point to be noticed is, that journalism has no proper place in the organization of the Papal Church; it is an excrescence upon the system, not its natural outgrowth. By the continuous efforts of the popes throughout the middle ages, and by the final adjustment of the Roman system made at the Council of Trent, all ecclesiastical power was secured to the priests, more especially to the bishops, and preëminently to the pope. According to the Tridentine theory, Christendom owes allegiance to an infallible episco-

pate, whose head is the Bishop of Rome. None but the clergy were to be allowed to rule, to instruct, to educate the people. Journalism was at that time unknown, or doubtless its functions would have been recognised in some way. As the case stands, the luckless Roman Catholic editor, if a layman, is *nowhere* in the ranks of Church functionaries, and can be *nothing* but the tool of his bishop or his pope. The Papal journalists of the present age—an age of reaction and obedience—acknowledge this position, and profess to be satisfied with it, proclaiming openly that they speak only as they are authorized to speak by the bishop or the pope.

These statements will suffice to clear up a few strange phenomena. In wholly Papal countries (*e. g.*, Italy, Spain, Portugal) religious journals are almost unknown. They begin to appear only in periods of revolution, or of general enlightenment, when the Church has to struggle against enemies who know how to conduct journals. Even where the necessities of the times call forth such journals, their indiscriminate circulation is not encouraged by the priests: the more pious and exemplary ecclesiastics prefer that their flocks should read no papers at all, not even the ablest Catholic ones. In Roman Catholic countries you may often hear those priests who are most noted for their devotion to the Papal See dilating upon the perilous tendencies of journalism. They fear (and with reason) that such an irresponsible power, even though employed for the advancement of the hierarchy, may wax too great and be turned against the Church. In convents, where, according to Roman accounts, the Church appears in her richest bloom, journals are rarely seen; the monk who reads them constantly is in danger of making his piety or his orthodoxy suspicious.

We can now understand, also, the otherwise inexplicable fact that hardly an instance is known in which a man, whose whole training and education have been Roman Catholic, has achieved distinction as a journalist. The youthful Romanist, whose views are limited entirely by the narrow boundaries of the system in which he has been reared, rarely seeks the editor's chair; or, if he does, however able and vigorous his intellect may be, he finds himself utterly incapable of coping with men whose weapons are strange to him. If he emerges from his cave, the new light dazzles him; if he seeks to sustain the cause of Rome by new ideas, or in a new path, he imperils his own position as a Catholic, and must either retreat or fall. Lamennais was the most gifted writer that had sprung from the bosom of Romanism for a century; in his earlier career he was devoted to Rome, and was even styled the "father of the Church of the nineteenth century;" nay, his apologetic works procured him

the offer of a cardinal's hat. But he continued to write; his genius developed itself freely—and Rome lost him. We by no means deny that many of the Romanist journals are ably edited; the fact is notoriously otherwise. But wherever you find force, freshness, vigour, in such a journal, you may almost take it for granted that its editor became a Catholic in middle life. His sinews acquired their force in another atmosphere. The following statements sufficiently show this. Perhaps the most powerful Papal journal that has yet appeared—certainly the most scientific—is the "*Historisch-politische Blätter,*" of Munich. It was established by Professor Phillips, a Lutheran, who held the chair of law in the University of Berlin, and afterward passed over to Rome. He is now Professor of Law at the University of Vienna. One of the chief contributors to this journal in its palmiest days was Yarke, an intimate friend of Phillips, and, like him, formerly a Lutheran. The ablest political pen now at the command of Rome in all Germany is that of von Florencourt, formerly an orthodox Lutheran and now in the service of the Emperor of Austria. The ablest of the French Catholic papers—the one which wields the widest influence in Europe and stands highest in favour with the pope—is the *Univers;* its editor, Veuillot, was originally an atheist. The editor of the *Tablet*—the chief political and ecclesiastical organ of the Catholics of Great Britain—is Mr. Lucas, (now M. P.,) a renegade from the Society of Friends. The leading Romanist journals of this country, both as to talent and to the frankness with which they avow the broadest ultramontane doctrines, are, unquestionably, *Brownson's Review*, the *Freeman's Journal*, and the *Shepherd of the Valley;** but the chief editors of them all were originally Protestants. The editor of the *Catholic Herald* was, if we mistake not, born a Methodist; and M'Gee, editor of the *Celt*, was, in his radical days, as hostile to ultramontane Romanism as he is now zealous for it.

Let us now turn our attention more in detail to the Catholic press in the United States. Brownson says in his Review (for April, 1853) that the pope is nowhere so truly pope, and finds nowhere, so far as Catholics are concerned, so little resistance in the full exercise of his authority, as visible head of the Church, as in the United States. The remark is well grounded. In no country of Europe can the Roman Church develop itself with entire freedom: here she may be as ultramontane as she pleases without let or hindrance from king or kaiser. No episcopacy can be as thoroughly Papal as an American episcopacy. Few European editors would dare to write as Brownson and the editor of the "Shepherd of the

---

* Now discontinued.

Valley" have done for the last few years. Most of the Romanist papers in the country have avowedly put themselves under the control of their several bishops; the collaborators of the most important of them are chiefly priests. Even the bishops find it necessary to emerge occasionally from the sacred gloom in which they generally dwell, and to appear, like common mortals, as newspaper writers. Unfortunately the prelates here, as in Europe, are not often eminent for scholarship; there are only two in the land (Hughes and O'Connor) who can dare, without the risk of disgracing the Mother Church, to enter the lists against their more able and learned but heretical brethren. The bishops, nevertheless, rule the editors. An occasional apparent disagreement between them need deceive no one; let the bishops but give the word, and all the editors are found fighting together. Thus, even in what to the uninitiated appear to be purely political questions, the Papal press utters but one voice: of European revolutions, whether in Italy or in Prussia; of revolutionary leaders, whether Kossuth, Mazzini, Meagher, or Louis Napoleon; of slavery, Cuba, and the Maine Law, they all think, or at least speak, alike. So it has been, and so it will be, with regard to all questions which the bishops may choose to consider as involving the interests of the Papacy. The priests and the editors who, in the American republic, could overlook the perjuries of Louis Napoleon and sanction his brutal *coup d'état*, simply because they hoped much from his success for the cause of ultramontanism in France, would contemplate with equal complacency a similar usurpation in America, were it possible, in view of the same end. True, we have heard, and may still hear, praises of republican institutions from Romanist bishops and editors; but, unless all history is false, we must always suppose, along with these uttered laudations, a suppressed *salvâ ecclesiâ*. Nay, these very men avow that they aim in this country, as elsewhere, at the absolute dominion of Rome. This love is for them the measure of every other.

Orestes A. Brownson is universally considered a high authority among Papists. The whole American episcopate endorses his Review; it is reprinted in England; and he himself has recently been elected to an Irish Professorship. The ultramontane party in Europe believe him to be, especially in scientific capacity, the first representative of American Romanism; and the Catholic press in America generally accepts his *dicta* as the words of a master. Even those to whom his bold and rugged utterances appear perilous in the extreme, take great care to speak of them most tenderly, if they speak of them at all. In a word, no thorough *Roman* Catholic can do otherwise than acknowledge that Brownson's pages are, in

the main, the truest organ of priests, bishops, and pope, that has ever been known in America. Very differently is he regarded by the so-called "Liberal" Catholics, a party by no means despicable in point of numbers, but utterly destitute of ecclesiastical influence. They write bitterly against Brownson and the whole ultramontane system; and their arguments are valid enough, but *not from the Roman Catholic standpoint.* Nothing can be more absurd than the endeavours of some writers of this class to free their Church from responsibility for Brownson's unrepublican and fanatical sentiments, and to stigmatize as a bad Catholic the very editor who stands highest in the favour of priests, bishops, and pope.

In these days, and in this country, any man of Brownson's talents and culture, who turns ultramontane Romanist, may be sure of soon taking a high place in a Church that can boast few members combining thorough scholarship with Papal convictions. In the communions to which Brownson formerly belonged, (we know not how many he has passed through,) he had many equals, both in intellect and cultivation; but in the Roman Catholic Church of America he is without a peer. He has carried into that communion an amount and kind of knowledge seldom found there; never of native growth. In dialectical skill he has no superior in that Church, and very few out of it. Though he takes the strongest and most unpopular ground as the very foundation of his ecclesiastical and political theory, he makes a much more plausible case for the Church than any other writer of the time; and he is wonderfully skilful in putting a new face on old arguments. Keen to detect an open place in the armour of his foes, he has the great advantage, besides, of having learned that armour itself, both in its strength and weakness, from personal use. Having passed through so many phases of religious belief and non-belief himself, it is one of his strongest points to contrast the dissensions and confusion of the world of free thought with the seemingly magnificent and durable unity of Romanism; and he *makes* that point often and ably enough. Like all renegades, he is intolerant and overbearing to a high degree; but his arrogance, it must be acknowledged, is well backed up by strength.

Not only in point of talent, but also of the boldness with which he maintains the strictest ultramontane doctrines, is Brownson at the head of the Papal writers of the age. No writer of the present century has painted the world without the pale of Rome in darker colours than he has done in many a graphic picture. The suppression of religious liberty in Roman Catholic countries is all right in his eyes; nay, there should be no such liberty anywhere if the Church could prevent it. He believes in "the direct *temporal* au-

thority of the pope, as vicar of Jesus Christ on earth;" and that the head of the Church has "temporal jurisdiction over sovereigns, at least, indirect, by divine right." He holds, in substance, that for Roman Catholic powers to kill heretics, as such, is not persecution, but punishment. He can "better endure open, avowed Protestantism itself, than stingy, narrow-minded, and frozen-hearted Gallicanism, always studying to split the difference between Peter and Cæsar, God and the devil." He hates and reviles those trimming Romanist writers who would detract from the Papal authority, even in seeming, and from prudential considerations.

> "There is, in our judgment, but one valid defence of the popes, in their exercise of temporal authority in the middle ages over sovereigns, and that is, that they possess it by divine right, or that the pope holds that authority by virtue of his commission from Jesus Christ, as the successor of Peter, the prince of the apostles, and visible head of the Church. Any defence of them on a lower ground must, in our judgment, fail to meet the real points in the case, and is rather an evasion than a fair, honest, direct, and satisfactory reply. To defend their power as an extraordinary power, or as an accident in Church history, growing out of the peculiar circumstances, civil constitution, and laws of the times, now passed away, perhaps forever, may be regarded as less likely to displease non-Catholics and to offend the sensibilities of power, than to defend it on the ground of divine right, and as inherent in the divine constitution of the Church; but even on the low ground of policy, we do not think it the wisest, in the long run. Say what we will, we can gain little credit with those we would conciliate. Always, to their minds, will the temporal power of the pope by divine right loom up in the distance, and always will they believe, however individual Catholics here and there may deny it, or nominally Catholic governments oppose it, that it is the real Roman Catholic doctrine, to be reasserted and acted the moment that circumstances render it prudent or expedient. We gain nothing with them but doubts of our sincerity, and we only weaken among ourselves that warm and generous devotion to the Holy Father which is due from every one of the faithful, and which is so essential to the prosperity of the Church, in her unceasing struggles with the godless powers of this world."*

In perfect accordance with this theory, he maintains boldly that the Catholic society in America "is, as under the pagan Cæsars, the germ or nucleus of *a new Catholic state;*" that our "American society is pagan, not Christian," and that it is in process of "continual decline and corruption." He declares, too, without reserve or hesitation, that "what the Church has done, what she has expressly or tacitly approved in the past, *that is exactly what she will do, expressly or tacitly approve in the future*, if the same circumstances occur." His political doctrine for America is, papacy first; the republic, if the papacy *will* it:—

> "But would you have this country come under the authority of the pope? Why not? But the pope would take away our free institutions! Nonsense.

---

* Brownson's Review, January, 1854, p. 90.

But how do you know that? From what do you infer it? After all, do you not commit a slight blunder? Are your free institutions infallible? Are they founded on divine right? This you deny. Is not the proper question for you to discuss, then, not whether papacy be or not compatible with republican government, but whether it be or be not founded in divine right? If the papacy be founded in divine right, it is supreme over whatever be founded only in human right, and then your institutions should be made to harmonize with it, and not it with your institutions. The real question, then, is not the compatibility or incompatibility of the Catholic Church with democratic institutions, but, Is the Catholic Church the Church of God? Settle this question first. But, in point of fact, democracy is a mischievous dream, wherever the Catholic Church does not predominate, to inspire the people with reverence, and to teach and accustom them to obedience to authority. The first lesson for all to learn, the last that should be forgotten, is, to obey. You can have no government where there is no obedience; and obedience to law, as it is called, will not be long enforced where the fallibility of law is clearly seen and freely admitted. But is it the intention of the pope to possess this country? Undoubtedly. In this intention is he aided by the Jesuits and all the Catholic prelates and priests? Undoubtedly, if they are faithful to their religion."

But Brownson was a Protestant too long not to have carried away with him into the new camp somewhat, at least, of the Protestant sentiment. In analyzing the philosophical opinions of his Romanist contemporaries, which he does with the utmost fearlessness, he often forgets his own principle of submission, and forgets, too, the unity of Roman opinion of which he boasts so loudly. There is hardly any quarter in which he does not find something to find fault with. Thus, at one time we find him assaulting, *vi et armis*, Dr. Newman and the whole school of converted Puseyites; at another he falls with lusty blows upon the *Univers* and the *Ami de la Religion;* and again, he turns his spear against the *Annales de la Philosophie Chretienne;* though all are alike sheltered under episcopal and Papal protection. In the heat of controversy he often forgets himself as well in assaulting Roman writers as Protestant; even the *Freeman's Journal* tells him that he has charged the *Univers* with tendencies which that journal never professed. Indeed, he is far from careful in his statements of fact, or accurate in his appeals to history. We have, in fact, very little confidence in his boasted historical knowledge,—especially of ecclesiastical affairs. Any cultivated man who has studied *both* sides of the controversy between the Papists and the Protestants, could easily discover from the inaccuracies that abound in Brownson's pages that he had not been brought up a Romanist. Apart from this, the Protestant *tone* of his style is often offensive even to Romanists. Although as a faithful Catholic he subordinates himself always to the Church, and especially to his bishop, and although, not being a priest, he writes no article without presenting it to his bishop for approbation, nevertheless many passages are found in his pages which seem to owe their origin more to

the mines of modern science than to Catholic tradition. A stupid Catholic pastor in Connecticut was induced by passages of this kind, and by others which were beyond his reach, to charge Brownson with a tendency to atheism, pantheism, and all possible heresies.

As Brownson writes all the most important articles of his Review himself, it is necessarily very limited in scope. He confines himself mainly to the line of apology for Romanism in the province of general theology and philosophy, and can, therefore, not be looked upon as the representative of Roman Catholic literature as a whole. But, in spite of this, his Review is undoubtedly the most important journal of American Romanism, and the only one that can be compared with the more prominent Catholic organs of Europe, such as the *Univers* of France, the *Civiltà Cattolica* of Rome, the *Dublin Review*, the *Tablet*, and the *Historish-politische Blätter*, before mentioned. The fact that it is the only scientific journal of Catholicism in the United States shows sufficiently the deplorable state of Papal literature among us.

A monthly journal (*The Metropolitan*) was commenced a year or two ago at Baltimore, but it has obtained no *status* in the scientific or literary world; indeed, the publishers only promise an effort to diffuse, at cheap rates, useful knowledge and Catholic principles.

Let us now glance briefly at the religious and secular newspapers published in the interest of Romanism in America. Of these the *Freeman's Journal* undoubtedly takes the lead, in point both of talent and of influence. The editor, Mr. M'Master, is like Brownson, a converted Protestant; and, like him, adopts the strictest Roman doctrines, which he follows to their consequences with entire fearlessness, and not without a rudeness and arrogance of style approaching to vulgarity. The assaults of Rome upon human freedom in all times and among all nations find in him a willing defender. No one cries out more lustily than M'Master when any step in American legislation, or any popular combination manifests even an appearance of operating against Romanism; but, at the very same time, the most rigid European despotisms, provided they only support ultramontane views, are for him mild and equitable governments. The Roman Church must have the largest liberty here and elsewhere; but for Protestants to seek a modicum of religious freedom at Rome is the height of impudence. In dialectic skill he is inferior to Brownson; but he has a certain adroitness in managing an argument which serves him, with *his* readers, in place of logic. Brownson, even in his bitterest moods, hardly ever fails to write like a scholar, and seldom forgets the dialect of gentlemen; but M'Master's style is often disfigured by slang that would not be out of place

in a bar-room. He rarely keeps within the limits of decency in writing of Protestants, and especially of Protestant clergymen. Nor does he spend all his gall upon heretics: even his offending Romanist brethren sometimes come in for a share of it. A few years ago the *Pittsburgh Catholic*, weary, if we remember correctly, of his intolerable railing, refused to exchange with him. He has a bad habit of overrating the power of Romanism in this country in order to overawe the trading politicians; and in dragooning his readers for an election he has repeatedly shown himself a master. In this matter he and some of his co-workers are, perhaps, beginning to think the Romanists have gone a *little* too far. Their general failure on the school question has, perhaps, given them a salutary lesson.

Zealous and ultramontane as the Freeman's Journal has proved itself, it is yet by no means a greatly popular paper even among Catholics. Its want of variety, of system, of organization, is sadly complained of. Its European news consists chiefly of excerpts from foreign Catholic journals, and of these there is no redundance. There was talk some time since of a daily issue of the Journal, but the enterprise, we believe, has been abandoned.

The *Shepherd of the Valley*,* of St. Louis, is also a thoroughly ultramontane journal, edited by a renegade Protestant. There are some tender points in Romanist history and doctrine (*e. g.*, the Inquisition, liberty, freedom of conscience, &c.) which have been carefully touched by Papal writers for a century past; but Mr. Phillips writes for American readers in 1854 as if he were in Spain in 1620. He tells us openly that whether heretics shall be punished or not is a question of mere expediency; that Romanist governments are bound to prohibit Protestantism; and that should his Church ever gain the ascendency in this country, religious toleration will soon be at an end here.

That these are really the sentiments of the Papacy every student of Church history well knows; but it has by no means been always the policy of Romanists to admit the fact. Nay, many Roman Catholic laymen to this day do not believe it; and both Brownson and Phillips are denounced by some of them in the public prints as bad Catholics. But the *bishops* sanction all that they have written. The milder Romanist papers do not avow such principles as the "Shepherd;" but they entertain them, nevertheless. Some time since the "Pittsburgh Catholic" censured the "Shepherd" for the outspoken freedom of its utterances; but the "Boston Pilot" (itself belonging to the "mild" class of journals) thus remarked upon the

---

* Discontinued since this article was prepared.

quarrel: "We are sorry to find in our valued contemporary, the 'Pittsburgh Catholic,' certain strictures upon the 'Shepherd.' Mr. Bakewell has his style of Catholic newspaper writing, our friend of Pittsburgh has his, we have ours, and so every Catholic paper has its own style. An article on religious toleration appeared in the 'Shepherd' some months ago: some of the statements therein were strong, *but true, nevertheless.* It was an article which neither our friend of Pittsburgh nor we could have written, yet it was true withal. Perhaps if we could have written it, we would not." Honestly spoken! Yet this same "Pilot" goes on to add—"If it could come to the point, we suppose that the editor of the 'Shepherd' would be one of the last men to hurt the hair of a Protestant head;" and, with still greater inconsistency, declares that "no Catholic wishes to abridge the religious rights of Protestants."

We must be content with very brief statements with regard to the remaining Romanist papers. The *United States Catholic Miscellany* of Charleston, S. C., the *Catholic Telegraph and Advocate* of Cincinnati, the *Catholic Herald* of Philadelphia, the *Pittsburgh Catholic*, the *Catholic Mirror* of Baltimore, the *Catholic Instructor* of Philadelphia, the *Western Tablet* of Chicago, the *Catholic Vindicator* of Detroit, and the *Messenger* of New-Orleans, are all weekly papers, published under the authority of the bishops of their respective dioceses. None of them manifest any great force or possess much influence; in the main they are ill-conducted, so far as organization goes, but are decent and decorous in their mediocrity.

The Roman Catholics of this country who speak the English language are, for the most part, Irish, or of Irish descent. While many among them are thorough Papists of the ultramontane obedience, there is also a large party—perhaps even a majority of the whole—who are for Ireland first and the pope afterward. Indeed, it has been matter of deep concern to the prelates for many years that so many Irish Romanists either become loose in their allegiance, or shake it off altogether after a few years residence in America. One of the bishops, in a lugubrious lament put forth some time ago, stated that if all the immigrants with their families had adhered to the faith of their fathers, the number of Catholics in this country would now number six or seven millions instead of about two millions. The bulk of the emigrants themselves, however, remain Catholics—but *Irish* Catholics. But Romanism in Ireland is a *national* cause, and is therefore intermingled with feelings, passions, and interests often discordant with the true Papal spirit. In Ireland almost every county has its own Catholic paper;

and it is therefore natural enough that Irish papers would be issued here to meet the wants of the immigrant population; and most of those named above belong to this category. Their reports of Irish news are generally as copious as those which they give for all the rest of Europe, and very properly so in view of the class for whom they cater. Among the journals expressly published for the Irish, the *Boston Pilot* and the *Celt*, (formerly of Buffalo, now of New-York,) perhaps, hold the first place in point of ability and influence. The Pilot, now in its sixteenth year, has probably a more extensive circulation than any other Romanist journal in the country. In 1848 it took the liberal view of the European revolutions, for which it was duly chastised, and became in course of time properly penitent. But it lost caste in Europe; and not very long ago the *Univers*, in giving an account of Catholic journalism in America, excluded the Pilot from the list of the orthodox. The Pilot transferred the article to its columns, but added, "with great satisfaction," that an American bishop, lately travelling in France, stated that the paper "had now become a truly Catholic Pilot." The editorship is now (or was lately) in the hands of a priest, the Rev. I. F. Roddon, who conducts it with a degree of moderation, but who nevertheless keeps it in line (as it boasts) with Brownson and the Freeman's Journal on all vexed questions, such as European or African freedom. The editors follow their natural Roman instincts and support despotism at home and abroad, *con amore*. Nevertheless, the Pilot is not flagrantly ultramontane; it even sided with the archbishop of Paris against the *Univers* in their conflict of last year. It is more copious in its news reports, we think, and is therefore a better source for the contemporary history of the Church than any other of the Romanist journals. It is also more reasonable and less fanatical; and, as a whole, may be considered as the best of its class. It is our duty to say, however, that in the arrangement of its matter it is an example of what a newspaper ought *not* to be.

The city of New-York is the proper centre of the Roman Catholic press in America, especially for the Irish immigrants. It is well known that this portion of our population tends to herd together; and this tendency is fostered by political leaders as well as by the Roman Catholic clergy. They have associations of various kinds, political, social, benevolent and others, in all the large cities; in some of which none but Catholics are admitted, while in all they form the majority. These organizations are useful in more ways than one; and not their least value lies in the fact that they tend to withdraw their members from the immediate control of the priests, and to habituate them gradually to at least some degree of

independent thought and action. It is a fact, that at this day Irish nationality and Roman Catholicism are disputing for the mastery among the Irish emigrants in America. Priests and bishops make many concessions here that are unknown elsewhere in the domains of Romanism. A significant dispute arose a year or so ago out of the annual banquet of the "Tom Moore Club" of Boston. Several of the Roman Catholic clergy attended this banquet, and the editor of the Pilot was among the speakers. It will be remembered that, in his later life, Tom Moore was anything but a rigid, or even a practical Romanist; and it has, in fact, been doubted whether he even died within the pale of the Church. It was, therefore, according to Catholic usage, quite out of the way for priests to attend a banquet in his memory. The ever-watchful "Shepherd of the Valley" soon raised its voice against the scandal: "We do not understand this respect for the memory of Moore. Catholics certainly have little reason to venerate the Anacreon of modern Paganism; and Irishmen, we should suppose, have still less cause to cherish the memory of a man who was ashamed of his country's religion during life. Moore lived in England and died in England, and after his death English preachers performed their mummeries over his grave." The Pilot bore this sharp reproof with laudable meekness. The Shepherd's views were "strong yet true;" but still the Pilot thought that if his "excellent contemporary knew the young men of the Association, he would not have written the paragraph quoted above: and that a little reflection upon the circumstances in which Catholic young men in America find themselves, would suggest to him certain reasons which might convince him that the Tom Moore Club does not deserve his strictures." Another instance of the "forbearing" policy.

No man of late years, perhaps, has given the Roman Catholic clergy of America so much trouble as Thomas Francis Meagher. Ardent, eloquent, intrepid, he is the pride and joy of young Ireland, and his banishment and sufferings have given him the added glory of martyrdom. His approach to this country was heralded by newspapers of all classes, Roman Catholics among the rest, with a feeling second only to the outburst which welcomed Kossuth. But he had hardly reached our shores before it came to be understood that for him, at least, Ireland was to be considered before Rome: and that he did not intend either to abnegate his sentiments on the subject of religious freedom, Church and state, &c., or to keep them secret. It was clear that trouble was to be looked for from this new apostle of liberty. The Irish Catholic papers at first sustained Meagher, though faintly; at least, they busied themselves in put-

ting mild interpretations upon his fiery language; in the hope, doubtless, that he, like the radical M'Gee, might soon be brought into fitting obedience. But this forbearance was by no means universal; and a series of bitter attacks on Meagher, in which the "Freeman's Journal" led the way, were soon promulgated from Maine to Arkansas. A very pretty quarrel arose; and, at least, Meagher went so far as to charge the priests of Ireland with the failure of the Irish Revolution, and to exhort his countrymen to emancipate themselves, in all but spiritual affairs, entirely from priestly authority. But one Romanist newspaper, so far as we know, (the Catholic Instructor of Philadelphia,) ventured to sustain Meagher in this dispute; the rest, when compelled to choose between Romanism and Irish patriotism, declared decidedly for the former, and Meagher was put under the ban. To the credit of the Irish be it said, that they did not forsake their brave and brilliant leader; thousands of them, including most of the better educated, sustained him and still sustain him. A new paper, the "Irish American," was established as their organ in New-York, and it has sprung into popularity at once, if we are rightly informed. The views of the party are well set forth in the following extract from one of its editorials:—

> "Our faith and course, as an organ of opinion—particularly for our fellow-countrymen of Ireland—is to separate religion from politics; they who endeavor 'to extinguish us' live by preaching up the connexion. We are for keeping Church and state asunder, knowing what evils the partnership has wrought and continues to perpetrate in the old world; they go to knit them closely, contending that all authority or power should rest in the former. We are for republicanism—rational American republicanism—everywhere, and the triumph of popular power over oppression and tyranny; they are for the divine right of kingship—for monarchy—for conservatism—for checking democratic tendencies—opposed to revolutions, no matter how profligate or brutal the governments revolted against may be. We are for universal liberty, education, progress; they for stringent rule, for military despotism, for separate education, and against all complaints, efforts, and upheaving of the masses. We oppose the dragging in of religion upon every occasion, social and political, in which the Irishman may happen to be engaged. We especially object to such a combination of words as 'Catholic soldiers,' 'Catholic voters,' 'Catholic chairmen of meetings,' 'Catholic speakers,' etc. These distinctions and denominations in the discharge of citizen duties are against the spirit of the American Constitution, which gives privileges to all without reference to religious belief. We would know no political or social distinction between Protestant, Catholic, Presbyterian, or Jew. We would unite them in one arch of peace, giving to each the fullest and freest liberty of conscience. We would leave religion to the Church, at the altar, in the sanctuary, to the family —not to be contaminated by the things of this world. They condemn and abuse Protestantism in every shape and phase of its existence—in religion—in morals—in the family—in literature—a condemnation and abuse which are mutual and retorted with interest by the parties on the other side. We consider the newspaper recriminations as evil and a curse, and never omit an opportunity to press the fact upon our readers."

On this the "Shepherd" remarks:—

> "It is certain that there is a party now organizing in this country with the intention of doing the last injury to old Ireland and to Irishmen, by taking from the children of St. Patrick that faith which has been their support and glory through ages of unheard-of persecution. It is well that these men should be exposed; in themselves, they are contemptible enough, and there is danger of magnifying their importance by treating them with open and serious opposition; but they have on their side the world, the flesh, and the devil, and who does not know that in our corrupt world, children can destroy with ease what saints and sages have with difficulty built?
>
> "What a mercy of God that these men did not succeed in their revolt! A godless republic in Ireland! English rule has been bad enough; but English tyranny has been enlightened benevolence compared with the horrors which these hair-brained revolutionists would set on foot in their native land."

But the "Shepherd" is dead, and Meagher survives! Nevertheless, the end of the civil war is not yet; and, indeed, no man can foresee the issue. The liberal party has the talent and the truth on its side; but on the other is the fearful power of the apostate Church, which has seldom been escaped except by those who utterly abandon her. The priests have sought in vain for a champion to equal Meagher; such men cannot be had "to order."

A very brief account of the non-English Roman Catholic papers published in this country will suffice. Among these the *German* press is, on all accounts, the most important. The vast immigration of late years has been made up of Germans, to a far larger amount than formerly—indeed, the prospect now is that they will far outnumber the Irish, who have, up to a recent period, formed a large proportion of the emigrants. The Protestant German states send us more emigrants than the Catholic; but it is believed that of the whole number who arrive, one-half, or, at least, one-third, were Romanists in their native land. But the losses to Romanism among the German emigrants are far greater than among the Irish; the priests have far less hold upon them in Germany than in Ireland; and here they often evince a sturdy independence, which, till recently, has been unknown among the Irish Catholics. The condition of the German Catholic press in America is a significant index of the comparative weakness of ecclesiastical ties among the people. In 1852 the number of German newspapers in the United States was one hundred and fifty-two; and of these only *five* were Roman Catholic, while *eleven* were published in the interest of other Christian denominations. The oldest of the Romanist journals is the *Wahrheitsfreund*, of Cincinnati, and it is the best, in every respect, among them. The *Katholische Kirchenzeitung* (now of New-York) does no credit either to Rome or to the German tongue.

Besides the Germans, three other nations of continental Europe have contributed their contingent to the Roman Catholic population of this country—France, Spain, and Italy. The immigrants from these lands are comparatively few in number, and do not seem to combine for political purposes as do the Irish and Germans. The population of Louisiana is still, to a considerable extent, French and Romanist; and the *Propagateur Catholique*, of New-Orleans, has for eighteen years been their organ. It is well conducted, but ultramontane. The most widely known French newspaper in the country is the *Courrier des Etats Unis*, of New-York, which was formerly a republican paper, and neutral or indifferent in religious affairs. Since the usurpation of Louis Napoleon, it has become, to a decided extent, a Romanist paper. The Spaniards have a paper in New-York and another in New-Orleans, but neither of them is of much weight. They are first Spanish, then Catholic. There is no Romanist journal in the United States in the Italian language.

Since this paper was written a great change has come over the spirit of the Roman Catholic press, and of the bishops, too, we opine. The exultant and defiant tone in which they were wont to insult the Protestant feeling of the nation in 1852—just before and after the election of President Pierce—pervades their writings no longer. The spirit of fear evidently possesses them, and well it may. One of the strongest possible signs of this change is afforded by Brownson's Review for July, 1854, which contains an article on "Native Americanism," and another on "Schools and Education," setting forth doctrines which no Romanist would have dreamed of promulgating, except in an hour of dismay. Speaking of the fathers and founders of the American republic, Mr. Brownson says:—

> "In all they did there was a wise moderation, a sobriety, and a good sense, which proved that they had in them the elements of a great, free, and noble people. In this respect, there is a marked difference between them and every considerable class of immigrants, except those of the old English stock. The Irish, owing to the fact of their having been for ages in a state of hostility to their government, to their never having regarded the government of England over their country as legitimate, or her laws as binding upon them in conscience, have never acquired the American respect for law as a civil enactment; and though loyal by nature, they require the law to be embodied in a person, and represented by a chief. We see this in their tendency to group around an individual, and to follow blindly the leader who chances for the moment to possess their confidence. They are republican in their convictions—no people more so; but they retain in their interior life many of the habits which belonged to them when Ireland was ruled by chieftains, and each sept or clan followed to the death the banner of its chief. The Germans have been accustomed to regard their princes as the living law, and when they escape from this authority, if not Catholics, they lose their respect for the laws, become wild democrats, and favour either the despotism of the state or the unrestricted freedom of the

> individual, and are socialists or anarchists. But whatever the doctrines they avow, or the real convictions of their minds, it must be conceded that the great body of foreigners naturalized or simply resident among us are not republican in their spirit, their interior habits, and their interior life and discipline. They have not that inward and abiding sense of the state, of law in the abstract, and of liberty with authority, which is so essential to practical as distinguished from theoretical republicanism. Hence their invariable tendency to confound republicanism with democracy, and democracy with radicalism. They lack practical republican training. You feel it the moment you begin to converse with them, and it is the want of this interior republican discipline in uneducated Catholic immigrants that strengthens the suspicion that Catholicity is incompatible with republicanism,—a suspicion both unjust and ridiculous, for the defect under a republican point of view is the result of their previous political, not of their religious life."

The entire article, in fact, is a plea for Native Americanism. The Roman Catholics were as much astounded at its appearance as the rest of mankind; and it was too much to expect of their human nature that they would take it easily. In a very short time the whole clan of Irish and German Romanist newspapers was about the daring editor's ears. An "explanation" was called for and given by Mr. Brownson in the "Catholic Mirror," from which the following extract is taken:—

> "I had a motive in what I did, and a motive which I supposed would be *patent enough to every intelligent Catholic;* but it seems that in this I overrated their sagacity, and of course must suffer for my mistake. The end I had in view was, I am sure, such as every Catholic who is, and every foreigner who wishes to become, a citizen of this Union would have heartily approved; and believing that I enjoyed the confidence of the Catholic public, I felt very sure of accomplishing it. But I was mistaken, and by the hastiness and passion of my Catholic friends, it has been defeated.
>
> "But allow me, gentlemen, to conclude by calling your attention to one or two facts which should be known without my telling them. *We Catholics are in a small minority, and the sentiment of the country is strongly anti-Catholic.* Every measure that we oppose as hostile to us, the country will favour and adopt; and every measure we *support as favourable to our interest, it will reject.* I am sorry that it is so, but so it is; and I think that in regard to matters which depend on popular votes, and in which we are interested as Catholics, the more quiet we keep the better it will be for us. *You ought from this to understand me.*"

Comment on all this is needless. It is clear that the Jesuits are not all dead. Mr. Brownson gives a more extended and cautious "explanation" in his number for January, 1854:— 5?

> "It cannot be denied that the immense majority of our Catholic population have emigrated from various foreign states, principally Ireland and Germany, and have brought with them, as it could not otherwise happen, foreign sentiments, attachments, associations, habits, manners, and usages. They bear not on coming here the stamp of the American mint, and are to the American people foreigners in feeling and character. This is not said by way of disparagement to either party, but as a fact, and a fact that gives to our Church something of a foreign aspect, and prevents her from appearing to the natives as a national or integral element in American life. They are apt therefore,

to conclude from it, not only that the mass of Catholics are foreigners, or of foreign birth and manners, tastes and education, but that Catholicity itself is foreign to the real American people, and can never coalesce with our peculiar national sentiment, or prevail here without altering or destroying our distinctive nationality. This conclusion, all unfounded as it is, is nevertheless honestly entertained by many, and directly or indirectly enlists on the side of the Know-Nothing movement, not simply the anti-Catholic bigots and demagogues of the country, but a very considerable portion of the more sober non-Catholic body of Americans, who, though they love not our religion, would otherwise stand by the religious liberty recognised and guaranteed by our Constitution and laws.

"It was to meet this view of the case, that we wrote in our last Review the article on *Native Americanism.* We saw, or thought we saw, the sentiment of American nationality fearfully excited against Catholics; we saw a storm gathering and ready to break in fury over our heads; we saw anti-Catholic mobs and riots taking place in a large number of the states; we saw that Catholics could be attacked, their persons and property endangered, and their churches desecrated or demolished, with impunity; we saw that the authorities were in most places favourable to our anti-Catholic assailants, and indisposed to afford us protection, and that Catholics, a feeble minority as we are, could, however brave and resolute, do little to protect ourselves in a hand-to-hand fight. We found a secret sympathy with the Know-Nothing movement where we least expected it, and men secretly encouraging it who would naturally condemn it, actuated by dislike to foreignism rather than by any active hostility to Catholicity as distinguished from the foreign elements accidentally associated with it. We wrote mainly for these, to show them that they had no reason for their secret or open sympathy, for we, a staunch Catholic, were a natural-born American citizen, and as truly and intensely American as the best of them.

"Some of our friends, mistaking our purpose and wholly misconceiving the drift of our argument, construed our remarks into an attack on our foreign population, and as an especial insult to Irish Catholics,—not stopping to reflect that a Catholic American publicist could not possibly dream of insulting the Irish Catholics in the United States, unless an absolute fool or madman, neither of which any of our Catholic or non-Catholic friends readily believe us to be. We deeply regret the misapprehension of our friends, and their hasty and uncalled-for denunciations of us; because they have thereby, unwittingly, played for the moment into the hands of the Know-Nothings; because they have, as far as they could, given a practical refutation of our argument, and confirmed in the minds of our non-Catholic countrymen the very impression which we wished to efface,—that an American cannot become a Catholic, be a good Catholic, and maintain his standing among his Catholic brethren, without virtually renouncing his nationality, ceasing to feel and act as an American, and making himself a foreigner in the land of his birth. We fear the denunciations of us, under the circumstances, by the larger portion of the Catholic press in the English tongue, will hereafter, when it is no longer an object with them to excite Catholics against us personally, be used by the Know-Nothings with terrible effect against the Catholic population of the country. We hope, however, that the candid among our non-Catholic countrymen—and we trust that there are many such—will not fail to perceive, what is the real fact, that these denunciations, after all, do not make anything against our position, for the offence which our Catholic friends took was taken in their quality of foreigners, not in their quality of Catholics."

Mr. Brownson goes on at great length, and with great skill, to justify his *quasi* Native American position. But our readers—

and perhaps some of his—already understand that he, like the rest of the apologists for Rome, can take any side of any public question when the interests of the *Church* demand it.

We close with an extract from the "Pastoral Letter of the Archbishop and Bishops of the Province of New-York to their venerable brethren of the clergy and beloved children of the laity," with reference to the public press. It will be found to confirm the views given in the earlier pages of this article, although those pages were written months before the session of the "council" which issued the "Pastoral."

> "Two other subjects, dearly beloved brethren, have engaged the attention of the fathers in the council which has just been brought to a close. One is, the indiscriminate reception into your families of journals not at all calculated to impart, either to you or to those committed to your care, those solid maxims of public instruction which would tend to edification. We do not here intend to speak of merely secular papers. But we do speak rather of those which, taking advantage of certain feelings supposed to be alive in your breasts, whether in reference to kindred, country, or religion, involve you in political relations which it would be expedient for you to avoid; except, indeed, in the sense in which it is the right of every freeman to give his vote freely, conscientiously, individually, as often as the laws of the country call upon and authorize him to do so. There appears to be abroad an ignorance or prejudice on this subject, which it would be our desire and your interest to have removed. It is to the effect that every paper which advocates, or professes to advocate, the Catholic religion, or which advocates some imaginary foreign interest in this country, is, as a matter of course, under the direction of the priests and bishops in the locality where it is published, and consequently authorized to speak for and in the name of the Catholic Church. Hence, when the editors of such papers publish their own sentiments, by virtue of their indisputable right to exercise the liberty of the press, it is assumed by persons outside of our communion that they speak in the name of the Church, and under direction of her pastors. Nothing could be more false than this inference, and we exhort you, venerable and beloved brethren, to leave nothing unsaid or undone to remove every shadow of foundation for this inference, so absurd in itself, but yet so injurious to us."

The cautious language here employed will afford an admirable cover for escape when any Roman Catholic journalist may happen to incur public odium by advocating too openly the *real* doctrines of the Papacy.

ART. V.—THE RELATION OF BAPTIZED INFANTS TO THE CHURCH.

AMONG the many noble traits of the early and heroic age of Christianity, there is none more conspicuous than its chivalrous devotion to the Church. The Church—in its unity and complete organization—stood out from the world with all the prominence of the camp of Israel amid the wilderness. To the early martyr it seemed not a mere natural development of the invisible communion of saints, an optional association springing up around the ministry, with ordinances that were mere arbitrary symbols standing alone and powerless. To him, the Church, formed by the hand of Christ and animated by his Spirit, had a personal existence, and went forth on her mission a conscious powerful being. She was to him as a mother. She found him lying by the wayside of life, blind and helpless, and she gave him light and nurture for his infancy in grace, bore with his waywardness, rebuked his follies, adapted instruction to his growing capacity, relieved his necessities, and cheered him in affliction and a martyr's lot. Folded in her arms, his tremulous soul was safe; cast out by her, he was lost. All the varied utterances of her ministry seemed tones of the same voice of wisdom; all ministrations the kind offices of the same strong hand. True it was that he looked for all grace from Christ; but the Church was Christ's body—the living form through which his Spirit wrought its wonders upon the dead world.

At the base of this vivid conception of the Church there lies a great truth connected with most momentous practical conclusions; the truth that to the adult world, at least, the Church is the sole authenticated channel of the grace peculiar to the gospel dispensation, and that in her organization and institutions we are to look for the necessary and the adequate means of all the Spirit's saving operations. However human infirmity and the craft of Satan may have obscured and perverted this truth, it is a truth still. The figments of an absolute outward unity of the Church—of the talismanic power of sacraments and forms—may have burlesqued it; yet should the body of Christ never forget that both revelation and observation attest the general principle that, except as her lips breathe the word and her hand extends the blessing, the sick are not healed, nor do the dead hear his voice and live.*

---

* Once for all it must be understood that in discussing in these few pages what would require a volume for its elaborate exposition, we cannot guard minute

In illustrating and guarding this truth we proceed to show that,—

I. *The Church is an organic body.*

The stone whose strength or beauty attracts us is not an organic body; its particles arranged once for all by the forming hand of nature, are held together by a mere inactive adhesion. Nor is a watch an organic body, for although its wheels may be well arranged to turn its index regularly, it lacks the essential element—it has mechanism, but not organism. But an organic body is one which, by virtue of its own structure, has power to draw new material from without to perpetuate and increase its substance, and by the appropriate and mutual action of each separate particle, to preserve the health and active power of every other. Thus, a plant is an organic body; its absorbent roots and breathing leaves are organs through which it imbibes and assimilates new materials, and by the energy which works through every particle of sap and fibre, each atom is at once sustaining and sustained. The continued health of each is guaranteed by its connexion and participation in the general structure.

Now, we lay stress upon the fact that the Church is an organic body—not a mere association of individuals, like a sand-heap; not even a mass attracted together and compacted by a magnetic sympathy, nor yet an association so constituted as to give concentration and system to efforts for a given object, like business or benevolent societies, which are rather mechanized than organized; but the Church of God is a body so constructed that through the pervading energy of the Holy Ghost, it has all adequate powers for rapid absorption of the world into itself, and by the right action of each function and of each particular soul, is competent to give health to every other in its system.

Now that it is only through the action of the Church that the world at large receives the effectual grace of Christ is obvious at a glance. Nations to whom the voice of the Church has never come, or individuals in a Christian land, shut in ignorantly or wilfully from her ministrations, are, for aught we can see, as devoid of any evidences of regenerating power as though there were no gospel message and no gospel grace. Apparent exceptions can generally be identified as cases where a straggling or a reflected ray has glimmered upon some heart shut in from "the light of life." The great Head of the Church will not give her assurance of any salva-

---

points and insert every qualification as we proceed. The general balance and symmetry of the article must serve the purpose.

tion to the adult world, of which she herself is not the instrument.

But it is less generally comprehended how the heathen man, alarmed, convinced of sin, willing to obey the precepts, and relying on the atonement declared by the Church, and thus prepared to receive the seal of regeneration, is not now independent of her, but is still to receive his maturing and perfecting grace through connexion with the body into which he has been admitted. Her public instruction and direction of his private study of the word, her open or private rebuke of his faults, her incitement and guidance of his active Christian life, her social atmosphere replacing the poisoned air of godless dissipation, her seasons of united worship and fellowship of the Holy Ghost sending a fresh thrill of electric power through each weary spirit, and her ministry in affliction and death, are the channels through which daily and sufficient grace is given to mould the rough and imperfect likeness of Christ into a perfect image. The instance of a heathen convert presents the truth more boldly but not more strongly than that of any new convert. Rare cases there may be, where, in solitude or sickness, the Head of the Church compensates for the absence of her regular nurture by a larger blessing on the truths already taught and the habits already imparted. It is true, also, that sometimes amid great irregularity of Church instrumentalities and great want of a general spirit of life, some few may retain a close and living fellowship with Christ; but the majority will fail for want of those associated aids and impulses which a healthful Church alone can supply. Nothing but a special effusion of divine power, restoring the spirit and regular action of such a Church, could afford a reasonable probability that a new convert would not relapse, or advance with very doubtful progress. While alluding to the danger of even a partial withdrawal from the means of grace concentrated in the Church, our purpose is rather to enforce the truth that it is in their right use and action that any convert can attain the manly stature in Christ Jesus.

In the light of these truths is not the reason made apparent why Jehovah, whatever his reserved purposes may be, has only made his absolute and formal covenants with the organic Church; and, also, why, in the great commission, Christ only declares that he that believeth and becomes an integral part of that organic Church—that is, "is baptized"—shall be saved, leaving other cases as exceptions? Was it not because, under the actual constitution of human nature and society, no permanent covenant with men can be carried out, except in such organic association properly fulfilling its functions; and because the addition of each new subject of the covenant mercy is

demanded, both for his own probable permanency and perfection, and in order to perpetuate the whole?

II. We are now arrived at a standpoint from which we may define analytically the *rationale*, or the common sense, of baptism, as being at once the "seal of righteousness" and the initiating ordinance into the Church.

1. First, then, there is a personal and present fitness in the believing penitent for the reception of the seal of God's covenanted grace. Through the atonement, the guilt both of original and actual sin is removed, and he is justified before God; and, moreover, the dead heart is quickened with the germ of a new life in Christ.

2. There is a relative and prospective fitness for that "seal of the covenant" in that the heart, so subdued and regenerated, is prepared for, and introduced to, the action of organic means of grace, which are a pledge and vehicle of a continuous salvation—that organic body being presupposed to be in healthful action. Thus, the covenant is *formally* made only to a justified and renewed heart, about to enter circumstances which render probable its continuance in faith and love. Thus, again, the grounds are,—

(1.) The present and personal fitness.

(2.) A susceptibility to the preserving and perfecting influences of the Church.

The significancy and efficacy of the rite of baptism, and the ground of that deep reverence for it which has always pervaded the Church, are found in this view. In the ordinance standing unconnected there is no power; but in the long line of Church ministrations, of which it is the pledge and the commencement, there is a power to convey the spiritual grace demanded by the growing Christian until he is meet for heaven. There is no renovating power in the mere entrance over the threshold of God's house, and yet that entrance may be considered as introducing the restored prodigal into those inner rooms of instruction and ministry which may daily restore the new robe, and supply the invigorating banquet. If the Church be the body of Christ through which he conveys his blessings, then the formula of baptism is but the welcoming word of that same voice which is to speak continual wisdom and consolation, and the touch of the baptismal hand is the first kind pressure of that divine power which is to guide unto the journey's end. Fearfully solemn, then, is the responsibility of the Church to every convert on whom her initiating hand is laid. As the impenitent man around whom she throws few awakening influences is himself guilty if he perish, and still his blood is upon her; so the unfaithful or backsliding convert may be

dumb before the divine sentence which condemns him, and yet the Church also is guilty of that destruction, if through her cold and stammering voice Christ did not warn, and through her self-paralyzed arm he did not deliver. She has no right to leave her members to their individual privileges and responsibility. She has no right to rest satisfied with a desultory and general care which custom or accident makes easy. She is bound to see to it that a systematic and complete supervision and instruction should be a check to every backward impulse, a spur to every onward movement, until she sees her children "enter into rest."

III. We proceed to apply the principles thus ascertained to the consideration of infant baptism.

Assuming the divine institution and perpetual obligation of infant baptism as being fully proved in any of our standard theological works, we would direct attention to the general principles upon which it is instituted by God. We believe that it will be found that the reason and significancy of the rite lie in the same double fitness of the subject—the first present and personal, the second prospective and relative, which is the ground of adult baptism.

1. The present and personal qualification of infants for the seal of the covenant.

It will not demand an extended discussion to remind the Arminian reader that all infants are considered as justified unconditionally through the atonement of Christ. They have no actual transgressions to be expiated, and in whatever sense the guilt of original sin attaches to them, it is not imputed; and being thus guiltless before God, both reason and Scripture assure us that the grace of the gospel is so far bestowed upon them that they are not left to the unbroken thraldom of a depraved nature; but while as yet their will is undeveloped, there is no hinderance in them to the effectual work of the Spirit, which is invariably perfected if they die in infancy, and which as they grow responsible they may still receive if they will. The infant thus occupies the same general ground as the adult convert—he is justified from guilt—his nature is so far renewed as to offer no moral obstacle to the sanctifying power of grace.

The truth thus stated may sound more familiar and be better defined and guarded in the words of some of our standard writers:—

> "All infants are ~~by nature~~ in the same state as it respects moral condition; all are under condemnation. 'We are by nature children of wrath.' But at the moment when the period of personal existence commences—at the moment when the identity of the human being is established, so that it is capable of

moral happiness or misery—at that moment we consider the soul to come within the gracious provisions of the atonement, which secures unconditional salvation to all such as die in infancy. All children, we consider, are alike in this respect. All are on a perfect parity of standing; and, in so far, all are equally eligible to baptism, the seal of that covenant of grace by which they are saved. And this we regard as the proper, primary ground of eligibility to this ordinance. We know of no principle, either of reason or revelation, which authorizes us to make any distinctions between different children as it respects moral condition."*

"All I wish to say here is, that I do not insist upon any peculiar sense of the word regenerate. The term has been adopted in the following pages, because it conveniently expresses the doctrine of infant salvation. All I mean by it is, that infants are, whether baptized or not, in a state of grace; that they are embraced in the provisions of the atonement; that if they die in infancy, they will be saved; and if they live, they will come under the gracious economy of heaven, and receive the free offer of life."†

So argues Richard Watson:—

"If it be asked, 'Of what import, then, is baptism to children, if, as infants, they already stand in a favourable relation to Christ?' the answer is, that it is of the same import as circumcision was to Abraham, which was 'a seal of the righteousness of the faith which he had, being yet uncircumcised;' it confirmed all the promises of the covenant of grace unto him, and made the Church of God visible to men. It is of the same import as baptism to the eunuch, who had faith already, and a willingness to submit to the rite before it was administered to him. He stood at that moment in the condition, not of a *candidate* for admission into the Church, but of an *accepted* candidate. He was *virtually* a member, although not *formally* so, and his baptism was not merely a sign of his faith, but a *confirming* sign of God's covenant relation to him as a pardoned and accepted man, and gave him a security for the continuance and increase of the grace of the covenant, as he was prepared to receive it. Thus this *previous* relation of infants to Christ, as accepted by him, is an argument for their baptism," &c.‡

Thus it will be seen that the fitness of infant baptism lies not in any regenerating power in the rite itself, nor in consideration of the faith of the parents; for the covenant is directly with the child, and the parent is only an instrument of God to bring the child to receive the seal. But the ground of its claim lies in its own *present personal* state of grace.

2. We consider the *relative* and *prospective* fitness of the infant for the seal of the covenant.

We hold that, as in the case of an adult convert, the moral propriety of a formal sealing of infants as children of God lies not only in present acceptance before him, but in the fact that the heart duly prepared is now to be brought under those continuous means of grace, through which it is able and likely to persevere unto the end.

---

* Hibbard on Baptism, p. 293.

† Hibbard on Baptism, Preface.

‡ Watson's Institutes, part v, chap. iii, sec. 2.

Yes, we hold that to the Church into which that child enters, God has entrusted the glorious power of making it grow up into a developed and perfected Christianity. We hold that whatever grace of light, and power, and love, the Church can convey to an adult believer for long years humbly and earnestly yielding himself to divine influences, all that and more the Church can convey to the child growing up beneath her care. And as a healthful, watchful Church has a right to expect that a sincere and docile convert will not backslide nor advance with tardy progress, so she has moral assurance that the infant, duly trained amid her pure teachings and examples, shall not grow up in indifference to religion, or in a low phase of Christian character, but bud and bloom each day into a full and energetic piety.

So Neander bears witness to the sentiments of the early Church:

> "It is the idea of infant baptism that Christ, through the divine life which he imparted and revealed in human nature, sanctified that nature from the germ of its earliest development. The child born in a Christian family was, when all things were as they should be, to have this advantage above others, that he did not first come to Christianity out of heathenism or the sinful nature-life, but from the first dawning of consciousness unfolded his powers under the imperceptible preventing influences of a sanctifying, ennobling religion; that with the earliest germination of the natural self-conscious life, another divine principle of life should be brought nigh to him ere yet the ungodly principle could come into full activity; and the latter should at once find here its powerful counterpoise. In such a life the new birth was not to constitute a new crisis, beginning at some definable moment, but it was to begin imperceptibly, and so proceed through the whole life. Hence baptism, the visible sign of regeneration, was to be given to the child at the very outset; the child was to be consecrated to the Redeemer from the very beginning of its life."*

Thus the lamented Olin, in his impassioned appeal in behalf of religious training:—

> "To this end God intends the Christian family to be a school of Christ—to live in a holy atmosphere in which the children shall be bathed, and baptized, and nurtured as in a divine genial element. He would have them put on the Lord Jesus with the first garments of their childhood, and drink in Christian sentiments from the mother's loving, beaming eyes as they hang upon the breast. He intends them to learn religion as they learn a thousand other things—from the spirit and tone of the family—from its vocal thanksgivings and songs of praise—from its quiet joyous Sabbaths—from the penitent tear, the humble carriage, the tender accents, the reverent look and attitude of the father, when as a priest he offers the morning and the evening sacrifice. The new immortal that has fallen down into the midst of the Christian family is to be taken into the soul of its piety, to be sanctified by its prayer and faith, and to form a part of that reasonable and acceptable offering in which morning and evening the godly parents lay all that they are and all that they have on the altar of sacrifice. This, with faithful, diligent instructions and restraints adapted to the different periods and exigencies of childhood and youth, is the nurture of the Lord, the right training which, under our gracious economy,

---

* Neander's Church Hist., p. 311, Torrey's Trans.

> insures the early piety of the children of Christian families. They grow up Christians. They are sanctified from the womb. Even their childish prattle savours of divine things; and they press on to the attainments and functions of mature piety by gradations so easy and imperceptible that it is not always possible to fix the day of their espousals to the Saviour."*

Is it not clear, then, how the baptismal rite, as a *seal*, that is, as *confirming a perpetual* covenant, derives its highest propriety from the moral assurance of a continuance in grace, afforded by the organic and plastic power of the Church into which the baptized is ushered?

Let it not be objected that the quotations we have cited refer to the plastic power of the family, and not of the Church. The Christian family is only a subdivision of the Church, as originally each family was a Church, and as the Church, when formally organized under Abraham, was in one family. It was not necessary for Jehovah to institute the family as a Church institution, for it was already in existence; he adopted it as part of its organization, and the parent is as absolutely a divinely-appointed officer in the Church as any ordained presbyter. He is just as responsible to the Church for neglect of his charge, as is an unfaithful pastor. Through him, and through her who is one with him in this office, the grace of Christ is to flow in ceaselessly varied blessings of light and spiritual energy to each child's heart. During the earliest years of childhood, the parent is almost exclusively held responsible by Christ as the pastor of his child—and afterward, just so long and so far as parental authority or filial affection furnish a means of restraint from evil, or a stimulus to good, just so long he has a coördinate pastorate and responsibility. The Church can do whatever the family can do—since it includes it—and the Church, as the entire organic body, is bound to see to it that the family is an efficient school of Christ.

But, as the child grows older, and the privileged but contracted circle of its home ceases to confine it, and it goes abroad to meet other children and other adult associations, the Church is to see to it that it is shut in from contaminating influences, and to a continued holy atmosphere. In other words, as the Church has sanctified the family, so it must sanctify society.

And, in the first place, the *educational* associations of the baptized child are carefully to be guarded. It is not only that from its instructors there ought to breathe forth the same glowing piety which has hallowed the home of infancy, giving it to view all knowledge only in the light of religion, but the child should also be so

---

* Olin's Work: Religious Training.

kept from contact with other children who have been imbued only with the spirit of ungodliness and worldliness, that its budding virtues shall not be nipped by the frosty atmosphere. The Church must control the literary education of her children—provide their teachers and their companions; and while we may not exclude *all* children, except those brought up under Church influence, yet they should only be admitted so far as they can easily be penetrated and changed by the pervading piety and gracious influences of the whole. And, secondly, the Church must regulate the *social circle* of her baptized children. Since she cannot expect to transform the character of worldly society, she must be content to form a society mainly within herself. For a Christian parent to encourage or permit a child to go from a prayerful fireside to mingle with festivities of a circle entirely irreligious, whether relatives or not, is simply to dress up a young member of God's household for a sociable visit at Satan's. The Church is not to withdraw from all association with the impenitent, but it is to be understood that so far as those associations are not of necessity or charity, they can only be tolerated so far as the world will submit to the habits and regimen of the Church. Every element of high and noble enjoyment which worldly society possesses, the Church has also at command, and she can well afford to dispense with any companionship or indulgence which she cannot sanctify, and she must do it.

But there is a more direct agency to be exerted by the Church as such. Although for a time the teachings and the motives of religion may be blended with family intercourse and discipline, yet as the years come when the child emerges from the family circle and begins to realize its relations to the world and to God as a soul of independent powers and responsibility, the Church, as God's messenger, is to meet the expanding mind, and officially assume the separate office of instruction and nurture. Not only is a system of regular and classified instruction in divine truth to be afforded; not only are the early sympathies and energies of the young member to be directed to appropriate work of benevolence and usefulness; but, what is less thought of, a direct provision should be made for the expression of religious experience, for administering of religious counsel, and the exercise of spiritual gifts. A child's heart has the same social impulses and wants as the adult, and demands the same means of grace; if they cannot be given in conjunction with mature Christian exercises, they can be given separately.

IV. We may now state emphatically the idea all along implied: that the baptized infant is a member of the visible Church of Christ

in the same sense as a baptized adult convert, and is entitled to precisely the same ecclesiastical recognition and training.

Before advancing to a further exhibition of this main principle, we shall relieve the argument from a few objections.

1. We cannot deny that however true and appropriate the institution of an actual infant membership might be, if the Church were what it should be, yet our ideal picture finds little to correspond with it in the actual body of Christ. We ourselves avow it to be a sad and bitter fact, that an ordinance of God's house has come to appear an empty form—a burlesque upon a sacrament; and its solemn words of prayer and of covenant a lie and a blasphemy! Yet what of all this! Is the Church of God to pronounce His institutions improper and incongruous because she has failed to convey the grace which was meant to give them fitness and significancy? Evidently the Almighty, in constituting his Church, was compelled to assign her ordinances either as appropriate to an unfaithful Church, or to a faithful one. And it is hard, indeed, if men will reduce him to the dilemma of either shaping the portico of his house in a style only suitable to a shattered and dilapidated building, or to hear the discrepancy between the promise of his portal and the fulfilment of his Church declared so striking that he never could have designed the portal, and it must be hurled to the dust. On the contrary, the entire odium of the incongruity comes back on the faithless Church which has made it. It speaks fearfully of her disorder and negligence, when a divinely-established seal and symbol of her blessings has not in her the corresponding reality. Let her not hurl from her sight the reproachful monument; let her not shroud its inscriptions of covenanted blessings with a veil of flimsy explanations! Let it stand there until its perpetual witness and rebuke arouse her to prayer and systematic reformation, and she can feel that all its meaning and promise is yea and amen in Christ Jesus.

2. We meet the observation that the Church, without thus recognising an actual membership of its baptized infants, does much of which we have spoken for their Christian training. We admit the fact; but she has done it in a random and desultory manner. Her measures have lacked the connexion and the successive order of a regular system. The family is an institution by itself; and where a pious and judicious parental care has—by religious instinct—been put forth, there have been its fruits; yet there has been no system of responsibility securing such care to every household. The same instinctive sense of danger has led many a parent to shield his child from godless associations and amusements; yet if he neglect his

solemn charge, the impression appears to prevail extensively that it is his business, and the Church has nothing to say about it; instead of his being arrested for a breach of trust and spiritual infanticide. Sometimes during a revival, prayer-meetings are held for those young hearts which overflow with feeling, and with childish but spiritual thought—yet the plan is not kept up as though the children of the Church were *expected* to have any experience to tell, or any gifts to exercise, until the involuntary cry arrests attention. In our own Church, especially, where an intimate acquaintance of the pastor with the religious condition of the lambs of his flock is an impossibility, no adequate substitute is found, except in an occasional Sabbath-school teacher. Even where one part of the spiritual machinery is well operated, another is left unused. And thus, because the relative position of the family, of society, and the organic Church, which includes and should control them, is not understood and conceded, each jars against the other and neutralizes its blessings. In some few cases, perhaps, the infant Christian is nurtured at home, its opening graces sheltered, and a genial social atmosphere and a judicious Church culture bring it to full maturity. But how many pious families there are who do not believe the answers to their prayers when they come; who receive expressions of religious emotion on the part of their children with a suppressed smile of amusement; who regard their little prayers and declarations of sin and of forgiveness as so much harmless play, like their fancies of imitating all mature experience of business or military life. The formal and random answers of parents fall coldly on the little heart, which, tender as a tremulous convert, needs to feel itself fully appreciated and sympathized with by those it loves. So we continually break off the bud of early piety until the soul, exhausted and feeble, beneath the world's dull sky, puts forth a sickly blossom, or hangs as a barren stem. Though a covenanted member of God's household, it is made to consider itself as of the synagogue of Satan, and its acceptance into grace is made a problem for the future to settle, and its motives are to be drawn, not from what Christ has already done for and in it, but from fear of the wrath from which it has as yet no reprieve. No wonder that our children have to be "regularly converted" between the age of twelve and eighteen. It is as early as the Church will let them have their rights. And for the want of a thorough, comprehensive, spiritual activity on the part of the body of Christ, that highest and grandest application of the atonement by which whole generations should be met at their birth, and, unstained by evil passion, untrammelled by evil habit, unshaken by doubt and error, rise up to assert the highest power of redemption even on this scene of our sin and

curse—this grandest scheme of God is brought to naught, and made a visionary's day-dream.

3. But, again, and coming to the direct discussion of the identity of the membership held by the infant and the adult, we meet the modified view that, although the baptized child is introduced into the visible Church, yet it is not made a member of any particular branch of that Church, and, of course, has no claim upon the pastoral and ecclesiastical care of any particular Church.

> "A person may be a member of the catholic or universal Church of Christ while he is not a member of any particular Church. Baptism introduces a person into the catholic Church of Christ. Baptism alone does not constitute him a member of any particular Church. To become a member of a Presbyterian Church or a Methodist Church, &c., something more is required besides being baptized. Therefore, when an infant is baptized, although he is introduced by baptism into the Church of Christ, he is not thereby constituted a member of any particular branch of Christ's Church; and, if the baptism be performed by a Presbyterian or Methodist minister, he does not baptize him by virtue of his being a Presbyterian or a Methodist, but by virtue of his office as a minister of Christ. He does not, therefore, by virtue of his office, introduce him into the Presbyterian or Methodist Church. But he does introduce him, by baptism, immediately into the Church of Christ."*

Now, so far as all this means that no baptized person is by that baptism bound to believe all the minor opinions of any denomination, it is certainly true: for he is bound only to faith in the great fundamental doctrines of the one Church, and to a submission to such disciplinary rules as are adopted by the particular Church with which he is brought in contact. A denomination is only an association of separate congregations of the one Church, who, agreeing in some unessential matters, find it pleasant and profitable to maintain an intimate connexion. But just as ten men, heads of families in one parish, who may form an association based on agreement in matters of opinion, cannot compel their baptized children to membership in that clique, and yet must consider those children as members of their respective family organizations, and hold themselves responsible for them to the Church in which they are enrolled; so a few congregations of the catholic Church may form a society and agree in minor matters, but they do not thereby lose their character or their responsibility as parts of the Church general; and although they cannot claim that a person by baptism becomes amenable to their *society*, yet they must hold him amenable to their particular *Church congregation* as that section of the one Church into contact with which God's providence has brought him. So the family in which a baptized child is placed, and the congregation of saints of

* Sandford on Baptism, p. 18.

which that family is a part, and any larger section of the body of which that congregation is an organic part, are responsible for the nurture and training of every soul they admit by baptism, as much as if the unity of the Church were not *in appearance* broken by distinctions which God utterly ignores.

Indeed, the Church of God is awaking, and, in many instances, her practice is in advance of her theory that she has no right to hold either adult or infant members bound by her general sentiments on unessential points, although the general profit may be best consulted by letting that sentiment colour the ministrations of her pulpits. No section of the Church has a right to begrudge entrance to full Church privileges to a *Christian* dissenter; and even a regard to her peculiar harmony cannot entitle her more than to *recommend* him to union through another convenient and less dissonant congregation. The idea of admitting a person into the Church visible, and yet not making him a member of any visible section of that Church, is absurd. What is not found in any of the parts, is not to be found in the whole.

Of course, these views arise from a proper conception of the organic and plastic nature of the Church. Of course, the grains of a sand-heap may be in that heap, and yet have no definable connexion with any other grains of sand. If the Church were nothing but a loose catalogue of baptized people, it might be left in uncertainty where any particular name fell in. But if every member of the visible Church is to receive his nurturing grace through connexion with the body of Christ, some section must hold him in living unity, and be the particular channel of his grace. So with the adult convert; so with the infant member. So no man can be a member of the visible Church, except by his right to membership under some particular denomination, and in some separate "congregation of believers."

V. The same great principle which thus authorizes the baptism of an infant, both, or even one of whose parents are Christians, utterly condemns that unscriptural way into which some ministers of our Church have wandered—of baptizing the children of parents that are both irreligious and who are living without the pale of the Church of God. The error has sprung up in the new light of Arminian sentiment, which declares the equality of every infant in moral character and relation to the atonement. Standing in contrast to the idea of a *reprobated* infancy, or an infancy entirely unsanctified until baptism conveys regenerating grace, this doctrine of the universal gracious state of the infant race is a glorious advancement in theological truth.

But it is clear that personal character, although the fundamental, is not the only qualification for the seal of the covenant, but that there is regard to a prospective tuition and membership in the Church of the covenant. There were many infants in Abraham's day equally worthy in themselves as his own, and yet the *formal* covenant was made with those of the patriarch alone, on the express ground of their absolute subjection to religious teaching and discipline,—"For I know him that he will command his children and his household after him, and they shall keep the way of the Lord and do judgment and justice." So the confirmation on the day of Pentecost was—"For the promise is unto you and *your* children," &c. This great idea of God's institution cannot be impugned by that other truth which serves as a platform upon which it builds. If his ministers venture to go beyond their commission, they will only find that his wisdom in the limitation was greater than theirs in the promiscuous application of his covenant mark, seeing that Jehovah recognises two great facts or principles, while they neglect the most obvious—the facts and law of spiritual nurture. Their course will sap the ordinance of its inmost truth and meaning. The child of an Olympian boxer and of a bacchante was as intrinsically worthy as any child, and yet God gave no orders to put his seal upon that child if its parents chose to let him receive it in momentary mockery. And because the unsanctified nature of the parent may not, under our social restraints, be exhibited in such glaring excesses, there is no compromise in God's covenant system with a more moral heathenism. How can God, through his Church, assume a formal and visible charge over a child when the only officer through whom that charge can be exercised is not found in the Church—when the conducting chain of the sanctifying power is wanting? Now an unconverted parent, although living in a Christian land, is a heathen in all ecclesiastical relations. The more he knows—the more he associates with the Church and yet refuses allegiance to God and his Church, the more clearly is he marked as one "holding the truth in unrighteousness." The Church may have more or less control over his children, but there is no natural guarantee for it. Neither civil law nor the law of natural influences permits the Church to exercise that nurture which is the essential ground of her character as an organic body. It is true that the child may be as yet of the same regenerate nature as the Church itself, but the parental unregeneracy and heathenism come in between it and the visible body of Christ, and cut it out from a vital union. Instead of humouring the worldling into the notion that his children lose nothing ecclesiastically by his wilful separation from the Church,

the occasion should be seized to make him apprehend how cruelly he himself is debarring from his offspring that covenant *reality*, of which a consistent Church only refuses the *sign*. Thus, while the Church does all that it can for his children, it should endeavour to awake him to a personal consecration, or the redemption of the vows of other days. The Church may not stoop to the mockery of welcoming a child over the threshold of God's household visible, and putting the seal of a perpetual shelter on its brow, when the very next minute it must be let go unprotected, to the world, the flesh, and the devil.

VI. The history of the obscuration of the great principle which we are illustrating, may serve to show how deeply its original meaning has penetrated the sense of the Church in all ages. In the apostolic era we have but little said about infant baptism, but much expressed in regard to the relation which they bore to the Church. Before long a material philosophy began to encrust the simplicity of early faith, and inspired a tendency to reliance on the magical power of sacraments and forms. Forgetting its deep meaning as the pledge and first link of the long chain of ministrations through which power should come, Christians regarded baptism as a talismanic rite, conveying by itself a cleansing power. Yet, even with all this, a recognition of the early and true idea remained in forms which, even beyond the Scriptural requirement, asserted the prospective reference to Church training as an essential ground of the administration. The introduction of sponsors could have regard only to the future. By admitting them, whether a useful innovation or not, the Church recognised the obligation of early and incessant watchfulness so fully, that even in advance she provided against the death or apostasy of the parental Church officer by engaging another to take his place. The early Church thus bore witness to all after ages that it dared to affix the seal of a covenant mercy upon no child over whom, as the instrument of that mercy, it was not to have continuous supervision from its baptism to its grave.

But when at the Reformation the doctrine of baptismal regeneration was abandoned by the continental reformers, another doctrinal error came in to obscure the meaning of the ordinance. According to the Calvinistic theology, all infants were in a state of unmitigated depravity, and therefore baptism could have no basis in their personal qualification. Many or most infants were assuredly reprobate forever, and therefore the rite could have no meaning as sealing anything to them individually, in view of future influences. Thus, those theologians who expected to baptize the children only of those

who, as adults, assumed fully their early vows—that is, believers—declared those children baptized "on the faith of their parents." While another class, considering as Church members acknowledged unbelievers who had grown up in it, and their children canonically entitled to baptism, explained the anomaly of sealing a reprobate, by asserting the seal to be merely *general* in its import of a covenant to those who were not reprobate—the invisible Church of the elect. Having thus destroyed the significancy of the rite, they proceed to show that the Church membership of reprobates—so long as they are not openly immoral—is a definite expedient in God's organization of his Church to keep her in money, protectors, and material for conversion in the generation to come. The fact, therefore, that the simpler theory of infant baptism and Church membership which we advocate is not recognised by so large a section of the evangelical Church, is explained by their rejection of another truth—the universality of the atonement.*

In the Church of England there lingered a large element of the Romish theory of baptismal regeneration from a natural state of wrath. But, by the more evangelical of this day, there is always a prospective reference to the future contact with the Church means of grace. Thus, they consider the benefit of baptism to consist, not in a change of heart, but in a change of place,—in an admission to this contact with the saving nurture of the body of Christ. And this idea, in connexion with the intrinsic qualification of infants, is the true principle.

Methodism has been at great disadvantage in attaining a clearly-defined theory and uniformity of action in respect to this whole matter. With new views of the spirituality of religion flashing on her conscience, and a rejection of the gross theory of baptismal regeneration, she also had to adapt her system to the enlarged views of infant salvation which her doctrine of the atonement involved. And while her early theologians held views substantially correct and implying the theory of this article, yet the relics of High Church tenets and language have obscured its full lustre.†

Then, the circumstances under which Methodism has grown up have been unfavourable to an early recognition of the whole truth. For many years it was not a Church, but a society; and the spirit of the society has characterized many of her ecclesiastical arrangements. Her mission was for a long while almost exclusively to adults—the work of the evangelist rather than of the pastor. Able to do very little at first toward the systematic nurture of our children,

---

* Mason's Works, 1832, vol. iv, Church of God, part vi.

† See Wesley and Watson on Baptism, *passim*.

and accustomed to see those around us, in Churches or not, growing up almost universally into a godless maturity, she has not realized what the power of a sanctified nurture would effect. She has shrunk from the idea of any practical Church membership, and has quailed before the irony of Anabaptist cavillers. She had not recognised the prospective reference of the ordinance, but rested its propriety entirely on the intrinsic qualification of the child, and thus has been sometimes betrayed into promiscuous baptism.

But as years have brought several generations under her care, our Church has been reverting to the true idea. The only standard writer on the subject protests against promiscuous baptism, although mildly, and teaches the implication, in the rite, of a Church training, although less boldly than it should be stated.* Mr. Gregg, from the western Church, echoes the sentiment with still more earnestness, but with a less thorough discussion of the subject than the title of his book would intimate.† The fragments of a complete system of training have been gradually created or adopted as occasion made their respective necessity apparent in different districts or congregations. And now thousands of members are calling aloud for some more intelligible theory of infant baptism and membership than they have seen recognised, and many an humble pastor is calling, as we do now, upon those whose work it is to give the Church its full organization, to combine her desultory exertions into one comprehensive system.

VII. We bring this discussion to a close by suggesting briefly the measures which may serve in our branch of the Church to give infant membership its full recognition and nurture.

1. And, first, we ask the express avowal of the truth which we believe: that our children are not under God's frown, but in a state of grace, and are to be expected to keep in it under the means of grace vouchsafed; that while baptism does not *make* a child an heir of God and an inheritor of the kingdom of heaven, yet it does seal him as a prospective member of the kingdom of grace and of glory. In the light of this blessed truth, parents should be made to feel their fearful but high responsibility as Church officers, and their responsibility to the Church. And the Church must inquire more unshrinkingly into the fidelity of this the most powerful ministry within her limits.

2. The next ecclesiastical arrangement—easily effected by a modification of our Sabbath-school system—would be to *require*, as

---

* Hibbard on Baptism.

† Gregg on Infant Church Membership.

well as to encourage, every child to be placed under Biblical and catechetical instruction.

3. Thirdly—and here we enter upon new ground and a direct recognition of infant membership—the children should be divided into classes under judicious spiritual leaders, who may act as sub-pastors, develop their religious experience, and give them a constant supervision, and under whose direction social means of grace adapted to their years may be provided.

There has been an approximation to this system proposed, and, so far as adopted, crowned with great success in the Wesleyan Church of England. The children of the Church between the ages of ten and sixteen are divided into classes, under the charge of so-called catechists, who weekly meet them in a private room for Biblical instruction. In so far, they resemble our Bible class; but they have elements of power which it has not. In a private room, with but few together, there is a sense of freedom and a personal application of the truth; the heart of the catechist is brought into closer contact with his pupils than can easily be done in our larger and crowded school-rooms. There that little band sing and pray together week by week, and over their daily life as well as this occasional hour their leader has a close but sympathetic eye. Thus the claims of personal religion are continually urged upon a heart subdued by the atmosphere of a living piety. We find that in our protracted meetings, even in presence of adults and strangers, our young people, as soon as the first restraint is over, are very easily impressed, and disposed to yield to religious nurture and decision. And if the same earnest and immediate invitation and sympathy could be shown week by week—as it cannot in a Sabbath-school room—no limit can be assigned to its power. The published results of the British experiment confirms this conclusion, for although there is not as much direct religious address as might be used, yet the report is very remarkable. The memoranda from one appointment of Leeds second circuit say, "By taking the average, we perceive that one out of every eight catechumens has joined the Church in one year. This is a large result for the *second* year of the operation of the catechumen system, and may we not calculate upon having still greater success?" "The rate of increase experienced here would yield an annual increase of thirty-seven thousand members to the Church from this source alone." This new movement, not yet fully established as an organic operation of the Church, although sanctioned by conference resolutions, had been subject to great fluctuations from the change of ministers who are not equally interested in the system. We cannot speak of its present aspect after the

distractions which have for a few years afflicted the British Churches.

But our plan would differ from this system:—1. By taking the children at an earlier age. It will be noticed that these catechumen classes are composed of any youth accessible, many of whom had previously enjoyed little or no direct religious training. But larger results might be anticipated if while yet more susceptible, and just emerging from pious family instruction, they were brought into these class associations. The Church would thus supply the next link to parental nurture. And, 2. We would make these classes like our adult classes, prayer-meetings, and conversation-meetings, &c., developing the graces of those young hearts in privacy, and where no evil eye could intrude. We are convinced that even in the present religious state of the Church, a very heavy proportion of our children would manifest a valid religious experience under such nurture; if each family were right, nearly the whole. We insist that, believing as we do the child to be "in grace," the true way to confirm and elicit the child's experience is to give it exercise and expression, exactly as with adults, only guarding a childish simplicity against spiritual pride and levity. We see reason to think, moreover, that some, at least, of our English brethren regard their plan only as an advance toward a full recognition of the claims of their Church children. But the position of that Church as a mere society for so many years has, as in our own case, been unfortunate for an early adoption of the truth entire.

4. There follows, as a matter of ecclesiastical prudence, and as a precaution adopted by the entire Church of God, however various errors may have gathered around it, a second and public reception into adult membership. The rite of confirmation, as practised in many Churches, by laying on of episcopal hands and the supposed conveyance of any new or confirming grace to the child, we of course reject. But it does not follow that we should not have a special form, occurring at a given age of childhood, to recognise as faithful members those who choose so to remain. The principle on which rests the propriety of such a distinct service being applied to these young members, without impugning their general, or even universal fidelity, may easily be made apparent.

According to our Methodistic theory, all infants, although by virtue of their descent from Adam utterly depraved, are yet, by their redeeming connexion with Christ, in a state of grace, justified and susceptible of spiritual influences; yet this state of grace is held unconditionally, and by virtue of an unconscious involuntary connexion with the second Adam. But the time must come, as they

grow older, when, although their state of acceptance and expanding regenerative experience remains the same, the tenure upon which they hold it is changed. They are to retain their interest in Christ by a personal and voluntary yielding to him and reliance on him; the free inflowing of spiritual influences, all barriers against which were removed by their position as part of the collective world redeemed by the atonement, must be continued by the same absence of all obstruction, caused by resolute opening of the heart by the developed personal will. So the infantile hand of faith, hanging helpless, not in resistance, but in undeveloped power, was grasped by Christ's strong hand, and by his action alone it was held and sustained! Now, that strengthened hand must give a responsive pressure, and only as it cleaves to Christ will he retain his hold. The transition is assuredly the most momentous crisis in the eternal history of that soul. It were natural that the collective Church, however assured that the solemn moment would be gloriously passed, should yet mark that entrance on a personal voluntary Christian life by holy thankfulness and earnest intercession for the young voyager in his now independent bark. If, in each child's experience, the precise moment could be definitely detected, each might come alone. But if all that the Church can do is to mark the average of the ages when the transition from a state of collective to a state of personal grace is complete, it were well to mark the event, if not the precise date. So that even if the Church had reason to expect the invariable continuance in grace of each of its children, there would be high propriety in calling them at a given age to *avow* before the Church their confirmation in grace and hope.

But while as Methodists we assign to infants a larger grace than is accorded by any other Church in its avowed standards, yet we hold also their liability to fall from grace as the will becomes matured and independent. Especially, therefore, in a state of the Church, in which she fails to convey to her children the full spiritual influence for which God formed her as the channel, she must be prepared to see the effect of her short-coming in the blight of many a blossom on the tree of life. While, therefore, she welcomes those who draw not back unto perdition, she must, as a matter of ecclesiastical discipline, mark her rejection of those who will not hold fast on the gift vouchsafed. Those who do not give satisfactory assurance that they will by personal adhesion perpetuate their allegiance to Christ the Head, must, of necessity, be repudiated by his visible body on earth; and in love, and sorrow, and ceaseless expostulation, the Church should make them feel their position, not merely as omitting to come to Jesus and his Church, but as wilfully breaking

away from his embrace, and from the shelter of the earthly home in which he has thus far kept them.

5. While thus noting the transition from infancy to youth, it may be well to allude to the sacrament of the Lord's supper, since from its obvious inappropriateness to infants there has been forged an argument against infant membership. But, in answer, it may be said that the sacrament of the Lord's supper is in its very nature an ordinance for the second stage of experience. It does not, like baptism, require a passive recipiency as a seal, which the Church at the command of God can affix, but it implies an exercise of faith in a remembrance of Christ as our atonement. It is only, therefore, at that stage of life when such a personal faith is reached that it is appropriate to admit to such a rite. Thus, while membership depending on the *state of grace* is equally appropriate under either condition of its tenure, this personal remembrance involved in the second sacrament is only designed for the second stage—that of adult experience.

In conclusion, we reiterate the remark, that the narrow limits of this article exclude a full and accurately guarded illustration of these views. The great truths of the organic power and responsibility of the Church; of the actual membership of every baptized infant, and its right to be considered and trained up as a child of God; these we are most anxious to redeem from an obscurity into which they have fallen through circumstances above explained. We could not feel less deeply, yet perhaps we might have spoken less strongly and hopefully had we not reason to know that many a parental and ministerial member of our wing of God's household would welcome any effort to rescue our theory and our practice on this momentous question from the vague desultoriness which has hitherto marked it. Let the Church arise cheerfully to perfect her organization, as she has nobly done, as each new phase of her mission has been developed. It may be long before she finds her theory met by her practice and its results; for only in proportion as the family, society, and those more direct ministrations included in the idea of a Church, are in harmonious coöperation, will her power be complete. Still may there be a rapid approximation to the glorious fulfilment of that saying of the prophet Esaias, "And all thy children shall be taught of God, and great shall be the peace of thy children."

ART. VI.—METHODISM IN AUSTRALIA AND POLYNESIA.

Journal of a Deputation from the Wesleyan Conference to Australia and Polynesia, including Notices of a Visit to the Gold Fields. By the REV. ROBERT YOUNG. London. 1854. 12mo., pp. 444.

BESIDES the general interest of this volume as a description of a large and very interesting portion of the earth by an intelligent observer, it has also a special value for the Christian public. Commissioned by the Wesleyan Church to "set in order" the affairs of the missions established by that body in the various islands of the South Seas, Mr. Young had the best possible opportunities for observing the real religious state and prospects of those attractive regions to which uncounted throngs are hastening, and he has given the results of his episcopal visitation in a clear, comprehensive narrative, abounding in incident, but simple, unadorned, and manly in its style. Bating occasional redundance and prolixity, the work is highly creditable to Mr. Young's powers as a writer; but its value is altogether independent of merely literary considerations. It is a repository of facts for the edification and encouragement of the Church in her missionary labours, and for her instruction and guidance in future aggressive enterprises in behalf of the kingdom of Christ on earth.

There is a certain period in the history of Mission Churches, as of colonies, when it is proper for them to be set free from the control, and made independent of the support, of the parent stock. It is necessary, as well as fitting, that they should, as soon as possible, not only provide for themselves, but also contribute to the furtherance of the gospel in "the regions beyond." The time of "tutors and governors" cannot last forever; the adult cannot thrive on the food or submit to the discipline suitable to infancy. The Mission Churches of Australia, including Van Diemen's Land, had reached this important period in their history, according to the judgment of the Wesleyan Missionary Committee and Conference, in the year 1850; as it was believed that they then possessed "adequate pecuniary resources to supply the means for the accomplishment of this arrangement, and piety and intelligence rendering them capable of taking with advantage this higher position among the Churches of Christ."

In order to make the necessary arrangements for so great a change, the Missionary Board determined to send out a commissioner with ample authority to effect it in a constitutional way.

The Rev. Robert Young was selected for this office, and the results of his mission abundantly prove the wisdom of the choice. The volume before us contains the account of his voyages to Australia, the Friendly and Feejee Islands and back, with an account of the Churches and missions under the control of the Wesleyan Church in the southern world. It is our purpose to give a brief summary of its interesting contents, allowing Mr. Young to tell his own story in our pages. We have only to regret that he has nowhere given a full and distinct statement, in a separate form, of the statistics of the Church, and of the new organization under which they are hereafter to work; nearly all the information we can gather on these points has to be culled from the diary in which they are jotted chronologically.

One of the most remarkable features of Mr. Young's enterprise was the peril and embarrassments that attended its beginnings. On the 15th of October, 1852, he embarked at Plymouth in the Melbourne royal mail steamer. On the 17th she "rolled her masts overboard, lost part of her bulwarks," got her spars and rigging entangled in the screw, and was thus, in a few minutes, completely disabled.

> "When the day dawned the disaster became more manifest, and I perceived that several of the passengers had put on their 'life preservers,' and, from their very anxious countenances, were evidently expecting to have a plunge. One person had hung a bag of sovereigns around his neck, and seemed determined to save his money, or to perish with it. Another individual, under great alarm, inquired anxiously of one of the officers as to the safety of the life-boat, and being informed that one of the sailors had left the plug out of it when at Plymouth, his alarm was much increased. The waggish son of Neptune, who had been in many a storm, and who feared no danger, seeing the effect of his statement, very coolly said to his trembling inquirer, that the case was not so bad as he appeared to think it, for the first officer, having found out the defect, had with great promptitude put a plaster of strong brown paper upon the hole, to meet the present emergency."

On the 20th the vessel was again in sailing order, but on the very next day she sprung a leak, and the captain determined to put in at Lisbon, which port was reached, with difficulty, by the 24th. It was well that these mishaps occurred at the beginning of the voyage, for the ship was ill-built, ill-ventilated, over-crowded, and unwholesome. Had she even survived the perils of the seas, it is more than probable that her passengers would have been decimated by disease in the tropics. The ship was refitted, and a few of the passengers, who could not help themselves, went forward in her; but Mr. Young, with others, returned to England, reaching Southampton on the 27th of November.

There was every reason to anticipate a fair and prosperous voyage

in the "Adelaide," a new and beautiful iron screw steamer of eighteen hundred tons. She sailed from Plymouth, December 19th, in gallant style; but, during the night, the water broke into the forepart of the ship, and the stream, according to the captain and others who saw it, "was as large as a man's arm," and as it gushed in with irresistible force, that compartment of the vessel was soon quite filled. The ship refused to obey her helm, and there was nothing for it but to put back to Plymouth. All this was enough to discourage ordinary men; and there were not wanting interpreters of Providence to advise Mr. Young that "the Lord was against his voyage to Australia." Happily, he was not one of the "weak brethren;" and he only waited for the repairs of the ship to sail again on the second of January, 1853. But certainly there was never a more unlucky ship than the Adelaide. On the first night out, a heavy gale struck her and flooded the cabins, and three days after the coal on board took fire in the midst of a storm. Mr. Young describes the scene well, especially its comical side:—

> "One man appeared on deck in his night-dress, girt about by his life-preserver, encumbered with dollars, and with an umbrella in his hand. It appears he was afraid that the weight of his cash might sink him, notwithstanding his belt of safety, and therefore took his umbrella to act as a sail, and make him more buoyant! In the confusion which ensued, he by some means lost a portion of his solitary garment, and appeared in a more pitiable plight than David's ambassadors on their return from Hanun. Another, who in the hurry of the moment had been deprived by a fellow-passenger of a part of his attire, cried aloud for the missing article, exclaiming, 'I am prepared to meet death like a Briton, but I wish to die in my own breeches!'"

On the 17th Mr. Young landed at St. Vincent, Cape de Verd, where he expected to meet his friend and fellow-traveller, the Rev. Mr. Kirk, who had gone thither from Lisbon to wait for the Adelaide; but he had lost patience at the long delay, and returned to England. To add weight to this disappointment, no coal was to be had at St. Vincent, and the ship was detained eighteen days waiting its arrival from England. Again the supply of coal taken in was short, and the unfortunate ship stopped at St. Helena for another fortnight! But the chapter of accidents was not yet exhausted; the wretched ship took in water at her ports in every gale; the cabins were generally uninhabitable; many of the passengers were quarrelsome gamblers: and nothing seems to have gone on well. On the third of April the coal took fire again, and, on the 8th, in a heavy gale, the ship became so leaky that the passengers had to aid the crew at the pumps for many hours. At last, on the fourth of May, Mr. Young landed at Adelaide. The steamer was shortly afterward surveyed, and was pronounced unseaworthy;

indeed, it was thought to be little less than a miracle that she reached port at all. All these mishaps, it will be remembered, happened with "English royal mail steamers;" had they been even American merchant steamers, the world would have rung with accounts of American recklessness and cupidity.

The land in which Mr. Young had now entered is, as our readers well know, a rival wonder to California. The length of Australia from east to west is two thousand two hundred and twenty-seven miles, and its breadth from north to south one thousand six hundred and eighty miles, while its area is estimated at two million six hundred and ninety thousand eight hundred and ten square miles. It contains four British colonies—New South Wales, Victoria, South Australia, and Western Australia. On the south of Australia lies the large island of Van Diemen's Land, or Tasmania, also the seat of flourishing colonies. We shall follow Mr. Young rapidly in his missionary journeys through the several regions composing this vast portion of the territory of Great Britain.

The colony of South Australia covers an area of three hundred thousand square miles—more than double the dimensions of the British isles. Its capital, Adelaide,—a city not yet fifteen years old,—has risen with American rapidity. "The plan, including both South and North Adelaide, is well arranged; and, when filled up, will form a most beautiful city, with the river Torrens flowing through it, comprising several squares, and surrounded by a magnificent park. At present, however, it is but a skeleton, containing not more than fourteen thousand inhabitants; but around the city, in various directions, are scattered villages with from fifty to two hundred or three hundred inhabitants, and bearing names familiar enough,—such as Kensington, Islington," &c. Here, as everywhere, Mr. Young found Wesleyan chapels, with large congregations, and all the machinery of Methodism working as at home.

Mr. Young next proceeded to the colony of Victoria, of which Melbourne is the capital. His ideas of the worth of money received a sudden start from the cabman who refused to take him from the landing to the town—two miles and a half—for less than fifty shillings, ($12.) And, to show the rapid changes in these magic lands of gold, when he returned to Melbourne, six months later, he found omnibuses running every hour and taking passengers for 2*s.* 6*d.* each.

In 1838 Melbourne consisted of a few huts, two or three shops, a couple of small inns, and a wooden building used as a place of worship for all denominations. It has now a population of not less than eighty thousand; its principal streets are finely built with

showy houses of brick and stone; its public buildings rival those of provincial towns in England; and the river Yarra, on which it lies, has a substantial stone bridge with a single arch of one hundred and fifty feet span. The village of St. Kilda, two miles distant, has a population of ten thousand. There are twelve Wesleyan chapels in the town and its vicinity, most of which are substantial and even handsome structures, and all flourishing, both temporally and spiritually; five more are in process of erection, and thirteen additional sites have been secured; thus providing thirty Wesleyan churches within a circle of seven miles from the centre of the city. Mr. Young found himself at once amid the ordinary associations, duties, and enjoyments of a Wesleyan minister; his accounts of "breakfast and tea meetings," missionary anniversaries, collections, &c., might almost have been written for Bradford or Leeds. Not a few of the rapid fortunes of Melbourne have been acquired by Wesleyans. "Mr. P——, an excellent man, who has a large establishment, told me that he could name ten persons, just around him, who had each realized £50,000, and five or six others who had each accumulated a quarter of a million since the discovery of gold in Victoria." And from the liberal contributions of some of them to Christian enterprises it appears that gold has not spoiled them *all*. Prices of all sorts were after the California standard, if not, indeed, beyond it: coals £8 per ton; butter 4*s.* a pound; turkeys 21*s.* each, &c.

> "House rent was fearfully high; on an average not less than a thousand per cent. upon the amount paid in London. I was truly startled at the rent of shops, which in some cases reached £2,000 per annum; and I found that a family could not obtain two small rooms, in the cheapest and most uncomfortable part of the city, for less than from 35*s.* to 40*s.* per week, and the rent paid in advance. A friend of mine hired two small rooms, miserably furnished, not in the business or best part of the city, for which he paid £4 per week."

The "Wesleyan Immigrants' Home" is an admirable institution, which we should be glad to see copied in New-York and San Francisco. It has a large building beautifully situated in one of the most elevated and healthy parts of the city.

> "It contains one large dining-room, which is also used as a place of worship; one sleeping-room for single men, with an adjoining dressing-room; one room for single females; seven rooms for families; two rooms for those who may be sick, one for males and one for females; a large store for immigrants' luggage, and various other appendages. The building cost £4,000, of which sum £1,000 has been received from the government, and the rest contributed by the Wesleyans and their friends. The 'Home' will accommodate one hundred and fifty persons, and is generally full. It was opened on December 6th, 1852, and in five months it had afforded shelter to one thousand and twenty-six persons. It is not intended to pauperize the Wesleyan immigrants; but to afford

them a comfortable home at the lowest possible charge, and to secure for them pastoral oversight and direction. The 'Rules and Regulations' are excellent. Although the 'Home' is intended for Wesleyans, yet other parties, of good moral character, who will observe the rules of the institution, are accommodated when there is room; and hence it had received, during the time above specified, four hundred and sixty-eight Wesleyans, three hundred and seventy-four Episcopalians, seventy-six Independents, sixty-one Presbyterians, thirty-three Baptists, eight Lutherans, four Roman Catholics, and two Jews."

This noble example was soon followed by the city; and, to the honour of the people of Melbourne, they have prepared an establishment, at an immense cost, to afford accommodation to those immigrants who may require it on their arrival at this port, and in other respects have exerted themselves to meet the wants of helpless strangers. The police arrangements for this purpose are admirable:—

"On the arrival of a government immigrant ship, the official agent proceeds on board, and requests the master to make immediate arrangements for landing the unmarried females. When landed, they are, with their luggage, conveyed to the institution prepared for their reception, and placed under the care of the matron. They are permitted to remain there for some days after their arrival, and provided with all conveniences necessary to enable them to wash their clothes, and put themselves in a state of readiness for taking service. While in the institution, they receive religious instruction from the chaplain attached to the department, whose duty it is to perform divine service twice a day, and to visit in the infirmary such of the immigrants as may be removed there for medical attention. He is also requested to attend at the hiring of the young women, and to assist in procuring them suitable employment. The inmates who belong to the Romish Church are visited by their priests and sisters of charity. When the young women are prepared for entering into service, a day is then named for hiring them; and, in addition to its being published in the Government Gazette, it is notified in the daily newspapers. Not only are publicans and persons keeping houses of entertainment prohibited from hiring servants at the institution, but all others are obliged to obtain orders of admission into the hiring-room, by application to the authorized agent; and persons whom he does not know are required to produce letters of introduction from a clergyman or magistrate. Thus is great solicitude manifested to shield the young women from evil, and to place them in suitable positions. After being placed in service, the protection of government is still continued to them. If they become invalided, they are admitted into the infirmary, and maintained there at the public expense until their recovery, when they are again received into the institution, and provided with other situations. Should any of them be improperly treated in service, they secure redress at the police-court."

Mr. Young next bent his steps to Sydney, the capital of New South Wales, where he arrived on the 11th of June. Its magnificent harbour—Port Jackson—surprised him, as it does every traveller, with its wealth of beauty. The history of the colony, from its foundation in 1788 as a penal settlement for convicts, is full of romantic interest, but we cannot dwell upon it. The capital city,

Sydney, is nearly enclosed on three sides by the waters of the harbour.

> "The streets generally are laid out at right angles; thirty-four of them have each a carriage-road, of not less than thirty-six feet wide, and a foot-path of about twelve feet. Their length varies from one to three miles. Many are well paved or macadamized, regularly cleansed, watered, and lighted with gas. George-street and Pitt-street have continuous ranges of handsome cut stone or brick edifices, with shops that would do no discredit to Regent-street or Oxford-street, London. The new Government House, which stands in a conspicuous position, overlooking Sydney-Cove, is a very handsome structure, built of white freestone, in the Elizabethan style of architecture, and forms a striking feature from the harbour, of which it commands a fine view. The contrast is very great between this princely mansion and the canvass house of the first governor of New South Wales, or the wretched wooden tenement in use for several years. The different denominations of Christians have here their respective places of worship, many of which are spacious and highly ornamented; and the Jews have a synagogue. There is nothing of a foreign aspect about the city. As I walked through its bustling streets, I could hardly realize the fact that I was not in my native land. The houses, the shops, and other buildings, bear the English impress; the carriages, including stage-coaches, waggons, cabs, and omnibuses, are all constructed as in England; the busy population, too, are all English, or thoroughly Anglified; and so are the various customs of life. In the goods displayed in the shops, in the furniture found in the houses, in the grates with their coal-fires, and in the style of living, and mode of cooking,—you have England, and England only. The population of this very interesting capital, including its immediate suburbs, is supposed to be about seventy thousand. It is rapidly increasing, and doubtless destined to become an exceeding great city."

Our readers will be deeply interested in the following account of the progress of Methodism in New South Wales:—

> "The first class-meeting was held on the 6th of March, 1812, and the first love-feast on the 3d of April following. In July, 1812, there were three classes in the colony,—two at Sydney and one at Windsor. Each of the three classes had six members: so that the principal society in this part of the world, formed before the arrival of a minister, consisted of eighteen members. About the time of the first love-feast, the members of society consulted on the most effectual means of procuring a minister from England; and determined to address the Missionary Committee with that object, and also to provide ways and means for the minister's support.
>
> "The official letter written in pursuance of this resolution is without date, but was received by the committee in March, 1814. In compliance with this earnest request, the conference of 1814 placed New South Wales for the first time upon the list of missionary stations, appointing the Rev. Samuel Leigh as the first Wesleyan minister in the infant colony. Mr. Leigh sailed from England on the 28th of February, 1815, and arrived at Sydney on the 10th of August following. In his first letter to the committee after arriving in the colony, and dated 2d of March, 1816, Mr. Leigh thus describes the state in which he found the society, and the steps he took at the outset of his ministerial labours. 'My next business was to inquire after the classes that had been mentioned to you, and I was grieved to find that Satan had entered among them, and had scattered the feeble few. But, thank God, I found one class, consisting of six persons, who have since continued to meet; and I hope the fear of the Lord is among them of a truth, and that they will show forth

his praise continually. August 24th.—I met a few men and women who professed a regard for Methodism, and wished to enjoy its privileges. I explained to them the rules of the society, and formed two classes, containing six members each. Since the 24th we have had the pleasure of seeing three classes established, in addition to the three above mentioned,—one at Paramatta, one at Windsor, and one at Castlereagh. The number of members of society is at this time forty-four. Eligible leaders have been chosen. We have likewise a steward, one local preacher, and one exhorter. My circuit extends one hundred and fifty miles, which distance I travel in ten days. I preach at fifteen places; and in every place there appears to be a desire to hear the word of God. All that I can do is to preach once in three weeks in each place. This is complained of as being too seldom. But what can I do? Come over and help us, ye servants of the Most High!'

"At the conference of 1817 the Rev. Walter Lawry was appointed as Mr. Leigh's colleague. Toward the end of that year Mr. Lawry sailed from England, and arrived at Sydney on the 1st of May, 1818. The first Wesleyan chapel erected in Australia was the one situated in Princes-street, Sydney, built at the sole cost of the late Mr. James Scott, and by him nobly presented to the society. This neat and substantial place of worship was opened on Sunday, the 14th of March, 1819, by Mr. Lawry, and is to this day (having, however, been much enlarged) in constant use and in excellent repair.

"In 1820 Mr. Leigh sailed for England, on account of ill-health, but returned to the colony the following year, and proceeded thence to New-Zealand, to commence a Wesleyan mission in that country. While Mr. Leigh was on his homeward voyage, two missionaries were sailing for the late scene of his labours,—the Rev. B. Carvosso, who arrived at Sydney the 8th of May, 1820, and the Rev. R. Mansfield, who arrived on the 24th of the following September. Both of these missionaries landed at Van Diemen's Land, and preached at Hobart Town almost every day during their stay, thus laying the foundation of Wesleyan Methodism in that beautiful island.

"The work now advanced with greater rapidity; and the following statistics, kindly furnished by the Rev. R. Mansfield, will give some idea of its progress, as well as that of other religious communities:—

RELIGION.	Number.		Proportion to each 1,000 of the population.		Increase.	
	1841.	1851.	1841.	1851.	Numerical.	Centesimal.
Church of England....	66,361	93,137	578	497	26,776	40·35
Church of Scotland....	11,046	18,156	96	97	7,110	64·37
Wesleyan Methodists..	2,585	10,008	22	54	7,423	287·16
Other Protestants......	1,503	6,472	14	35	4,969	
Total Protestants.......	81,495	127,773	710	683	46,278	56·79
Roman Catholics.......	32,319	56,899	281	304	24,580	76·05
Total Christians.........	113,814	184,672	991	987	70,858	62·26
Other persuasions......	987	2,570	9	13	1,584	
Total population........	114,801	187,242	1,000	1,000	72,442	63·10

"No census has been taken since that of 1851; but the Wesleyans have greatly increased since the census was taken."

A still better test of the relative progress of Methodism in New South Wales is given in the following statement of the rate of increase of the different denominations since 1841:—

	Per thousand.
Wesleyan Methodists	287·16
Romanists	76·05
Church of Scotland	64·37
Church of England	40·35

Mr. Young sailed on the 30th of August for New-Zealand, but as he returned to Australia in December, we prefer to finish our survey of that region with him. His six months' absence had sufficed for great changes; in Melbourne he found buildings and improvements going on with wonderful rapidity. Several new streets had been formed; many substantial and even elegant buildings erected; and some large plots of ground entirely covered, on which not a house stood six months before. After a few days of rest he set out for the gold-diggings in company with the Rev. Mr. Butler, one of the most indefatigable of missionaries. It was the 22d of December; but the travellers were provided with blue veils to protect them from the swarms of flies and showers of dust even at that season. The roads were terrible; the prices of all comforts enormous—horsekeep for the night 20*s.*, a feed of corn 7*s.* 6*d.*, and other things in proportion. In short, the whole description might have been written for California, as California was a few years ago.

> "The diggers in large numbers were at their work, and the grotesque figures which many of them exhibited made no common demand on the risible faculties. Anxious to see the whole process of gold digging, I inspected several holes from ten to twenty feet deep; saw the auriferous earth dug from them, and witnessed its washing, cradling, &c. The first washing I saw comprised eight tubs of earth, which yielded one pennyweight of gold, and that was kindly presented to me. After breakfast we went through the whole of Forest Creek diggings, and also visited those in Campbell's Creek, where the tents were more numerous, and the fields more productive. I saw the whole process of gold seeking often repeated, and conversed with several diggers. At one hole I met with two men who had arrived a few weeks previously from London, and they were covered with clay, their very beards being clotted with it. After a few preliminary remarks, the following conversation took place: 'How do you like this country?' 'Not at all.' 'Have you been successful in digging for treasure?' 'We have got a little, but at great labour.' 'Have you felt disappointed in your anticipations?' 'Very much so; the state of things here has been greatly misrepresented.' 'What is your intention as to the future?' 'To get back to England as soon as possible, to let the people know the truth.' 'Perhaps if you were to get your portraits taken as you now appear, and send them home, they would give the people a better idea of a digger's life and position than anything else.' 'Bless you, sir, were we to do that, our own mothers would not know us.' To this I readily assented. On marking the whole process of gold digging, I was forcibly reminded of gold being in more senses than one 'filthy lucre.'"—Pp. 358, 359.

Everywhere among the diggings Mr. Young found Methodist preachers at work—where are they not? In the Mount Alexander gold-fields there were five Wesleyan chapels, or tents, one capable

of accommodating seven hundred persons, the others of smaller dimensions, "all supplied by Mr. Currey and fourteen local preachers." At the White-Hills a "tea meeting" was held in a tent-chapel, which was numerously attended by Cornishmen, and the tea, "with its saffron-cake," was got up in the best style of Cornwall.

Not fewer than a hundred conversions to God had taken place in connexion with the Bendigo dry diggings, and the old members had been greatly quickened and invigorated. One person told Mr. Young he had come in search of gold, and had found the "pearl of great price." But there were other individuals who had proved unfaithful, and become dissipated. "One of that class," says Mr. Young, "came to me in a state of intoxication, and described the great benefit he had received from my ministry. He moreover urged me to preach from a certain text, and offered to give me a tumbler full of nuggets if I would do so!" Mr. Young reports the moral condition of the gold region as vastly better than it was a few years ago; thefts and robbery are comparatively unknown, thanks to the preaching and to Colt's revolvers, which are found in every miner's tent.

Leaving the gold region, Mr. Young next visited Van Diemen's Land, arriving at Launceston, the capital, on the 4th of January, 1854. We cite the following for the sake of its application:—

> "On landing at Launceston I asked the way to the Wesleyan chapel, and the respectable individual to whom I spoke, inquired, 'To what denomination of Christians does that chapel belong?' I went on, and repeated my inquiry to another person, and, after rubbing his forehead for some time, as if to awaken his ideas, he sent me to the Scotch Church. From these casual occurrences I concluded that Methodism had not filled Launceston with its doctrines."—P. 375.

Our "application" is, that from our own experience, this kind of ignorance is a way Englishmen have, not merely in Australia, but at home. In the month of June, in this very same year of grace, 1854, we landed at no less a city than Liverpool on a Sunday; and the first "respectable individual" of whom we asked the way to a Wesleyan chapel could give us no information whatever; the next directed us to Dr. Raffles' church; and, after inquiring in vain of at least ten persons, we at last found a cabman who drove us to a "street called Wesley-place," where he "thought" there was a Wesleyan chapel. Whatever is an Englishman's "business" or "duty," you will generally find him thoroughly acquainted with; but beyond that they are an uninquiring race.

Mr. Young gives a very interesting sketch of the rise and prog-

ress of Methodism in Van Diemen's Land. Mr. Carvosso stopped there on his way to New South Wales in 1820, and preached in Hobart-Town on the steps of a small building then used as a court-house. Some months after,

> "a few pious soldiers, belonging to the 48th regiment, who had been brought to the knowledge of the truth in New South Wales, arrived in Hobart-Town. No sooner were these pious men settled in the barracks than they saw that the wickedness of the place was very great, and they immediately began to inquire for some convenient place in which to hold a meeting for prayer. In this they at length succeeded, but were ere long called to endure persecution for righteousness' sake. The meeting of the praying soldiers soon began to excite attention; many of the town's-people found their way to the humble sanctuary, and some were convinced of sin, and brought to a knowledge of the truth. At this Satan began to rage. Many of the people 'of the baser sort' assembled around the cottage at the hour of prayer; and by loud and boisterous shouting, throwing stones at the door, and breaking the windows, attempted to daunt the humble worshippers, and destroy the infant cause of the Redeemer. In this they were mistaken; for the more they opposed, the more mightily grew the word of God and prevailed. Tidings of these wicked proceedings soon reached the ears of the Lieutenant-Governor; the persecutors were silenced, peace restored, and from that time to the present no attempt at open opposition has ever been made in Hobart-Town."

The first class was formed in 1821; there are now twenty-three chapels on the island, most of them substantially built of stone or brick, and all *entirely free from debt.* The success of Methodism even among the convict part of the population has been very great. Thousands of them have heard the missionaries: many have been deeply convinced of sin, and soundly converted to God, who have maintained their integrity through life, and have died well.

Returning to Victoria, Mr. Young met all the ministers and circuit stewards of the colony at Melbourne, and had full conferences with regard to the proposed separation of Australia from the home Church, and its organization as an independent body. The subject had, of course, been fully canvassed in all the local meetings for months before; and the final result was a unanimous concurrence in the propriety of the measure, and the immediate adoption of vigorous measures to carry the plan into successful operation.

The following account of the progress of the Church in the colony of Victoria affords a wonderful example of rapid development. The *first sermon* was preached by the Rev. Joseph Orton, on the 26th of April, 1836, to a mixed congregation of Europeans and natives:—

> "Some apprehensions were entertained lest the service should be interrupted by the restlessness and loquaciousness of the untutored savages who formed the greater part of the congregation; but during the whole time they were remarkably quiet and attentive. There were then not more than three houses and three or four sod-huts in Melbourne. Toward the end of the same year a few persons arrived from Van Diemen's Land, who established

meetings for Christian communion and prayer, which were held in a 'wattle and dab' hut. In April, 1839, the Rev. Messrs. Hurst and Tuckfield, who had been appointed by the Wesleyan Missionary Committee in London, to the Aboriginal Mission in Buntingdale, arrived in the colony, and engaged to visit Melbourne as frequently as their other engagements would permit till some more satisfactory and permanent arrangement could be made. Early in the same year the society received efficient assistance by the arrival of several excellent persons from England,—Messrs. Parkes and Dredge, and others who were sent from home as the protectors of the aborigines. On the 14th of May, 1840, the foundation-stone of the present chapel in Collins-street was laid. It was opened for public worship on the 24th of June, 1841, and in 1850 was enlarged to nearly twice its original size. It was then, and for a long time afterward, the largest Protestant place of worship in the colony. The first quarterly meeting of the circuit was held at the Mission-House, Melbourne, on Friday, January 28th, 1841. Early the same year the Rev. S. Wilkinson was appointed to the charge of the circuit, and relieved the Rev. J. Orton, who had temporary charge for a few months previously to his departure for England.

"Since that period the cause has advanced, and, lately, with much rapidity. Four years ago we had but one chapel in Melbourne, then in the course of enlargement; one at Geelong; and seven other small erections in different parts of the colony. We had also one mission-house, and three ministers. The estimated value of the whole mission property was between £6,000 and £7,000, and there were debts upon it amounting to £1,900. 'At present,' says the Rev. W. Butters, 'we have twenty-two chapels and thirty-seven other preaching places, some of which are used as schoolrooms, and others are temporary erections on the gold-fields. There are also seven mission-houses. The cost of these erections at the present time would be about £52,000. There are also several pieces of land, on which it is intended to erect with all possible speed, chapels and mission-houses. We have nine ministers, and expect eight more in a few days.* Our present number of Church members is one thousand six hundred and twenty; scholars, two thousand eight hundred and twenty-one; members of our congregations, fifteen thousand four hundred. The entire debt on our mission property, chiefly on our houses, is about £2,000, and that will shortly be liquidated. Our state, financially, is good; and our prospects as to the future, as respects progress and spirituality, are encouraging.'"

We must now retrace our steps, and, in company with Mr. Young, leave Australia for New-Zealand. His commission embraced all the missionary stations in the South Seas, including the great missions in the Friendly and Feejee Islands, all of which he visited. Although the portion of his work which treats of these islands is in some respects more interesting than any other, we shall not quote so largely from it, as our readers will find ample information with regard to this field of Wesleyan labour in that valuable part of Mr. Lawry's Journals which have recently been published at the Methodist Book Concern.†

Mr. Young landed in New-Zealand on the 9th of August, 1853,

---

* These have since arrived, and others are about to be sent.

† Missions in the Tonga and Feejee Islands, as described in the Journals of the Rev. Walter Lawry. (New-York: Carlton & Phillips. 12mo.)

where he was received with open arms by that eminent missionary, the Rev. W. Lawry. Auckland, the capital, is beautifully situated; it has some fine streets and public buildings, and a population of about five thousand. It has a Wesleyan chapel, accommodating six hundred persons. Mr. Young spent a month in New-Zealand, attending faithfully to the duties of his mission, and instituting close and minute inquiries into the state of the Churches and of the country. He has incorporated into his narrative several valuable reports from the missionaries, from which we make the following extracts: "The population has been variously estimated from sixty thousand to one hundred and twenty thousand. I think it nearer the higher than the lower figure. It is my opinion that nine-tenths have embraced Christianity. Indeed, there are very few who do not consider themselves as belonging to one or other of the following denominations: namely, Wesleyans, Church of England, Romanists, and Germans. In many cases, however, their Christianity is merely nominal. They feel not its saving power."

The general results of missionary labour in New-Zealand are well stated in the following passage from a report by the Rev. Mr. Whiteley:—

> "Twenty years ago our natives worshipped in a room ten feet square; they now worship in chapels that will contain hundreds. Then, there was but one single native baptized, named George Morley; now, we have them by thousands. Then, they were under the constant bondage of *tapu;* now, that system of superstition is broken, and its remains are rapidly disappearing. Then, they were either constantly at war or preparing for it; now, their fortifications have fallen into ruins, their *pas* are abandoned, they are quietly cultivating the soil, and, with occasional exceptions arising out of conflicting claims to the land, there is universal peace. Then, cannibalism was practised to a fearful extent; now, no such atrocity occurs in any part of the country. Then, they were in constant dread of some superstitious or imaginary '*Atua;*' now, they believe that the Lord our God is one Lord, and that 'the Lord, he is God.' Then, they were miserably clad in dirty mats and filthy rags; now, they very generally wear European clothing. Then, they were regarded as thieves and liars; now, our merchants entrust them with goods on credit to the amount of hundreds and thousands of pounds. Then, polygamy and concubinage everywhere prevailed; now, the man is generally the husband of one wife. Then, many captives taken in war were held in bondage as slaves, and subject to the terror of the tomahawk; now, they have either been liberated and sent home to their friends, or, by intermarriages, have been incorporated with the respective tribes. Then, the natives probably had not a grain of wheat in the country; now, it is universally and extensively cultivated. Then, they had no property save their oven-houses, pigs, muskets, war canoes, little *Ropapas*, and useless lands; now, they have vessels, mills, horses, cows, oxen, ploughs, and money. Then, they had so little to do, and spent so much time in idleness and smoking, that for a full pipe of tobacco you might get them, in their way, to do a large stroke of work; now, they are so fully engaged with their own pursuits, that you can scarcely get them to do a day's work, either for love or money. Then, they had faults purely Maori; now, they have faults both Maori and English."

The following illustration of the power of the gospel in an *individual* case is perhaps more striking than any general statements as to the results of our missions upon the mass of the people could be:—

> "I had the pleasure of an interview with William Naylor, or Tawaiti, at the residence of Mr. Lawry. He is principal chief of Waingaroa, and has been one of the most celebrated warriors of modern Maori history. Often has he led on his tribes to deeds of blood and cannibalism, and distinguished himself above his fellows in times of war. He was one of the principal chiefs in the wars on the Taranaki people; was often engaged in slaying the weaker tribes of that district, feasting on the bodies of the slain, and enslaving their women and children, a very great number of whom were held in bondage by him and his people before they embraced Christianity. When the gospel reached him, he had a number of wives, mainly brought from Taranaki. On embracing the truth, he put them all away, save one, to whom he was married according to Christian custom. He was one of the first of the native chiefs who returned their slaves to their homes. When he received the truth, and was told that slavery was contrary to God's word, he gave all his slaves liberty to return home. Most of them did so, and he was the means of inducing other chiefs to do the same. He is a fine character,—naturally shrewd, intelligent, and courageous. Christianity has sanctified his intellect, and brought out the firmness and energy of his character on the side of truth and justice. William has always been ready to promote peace and good-will among men, to defend the oppressed, and maintain the cause of the injured. Many a long journey he has travelled to make peace between contending parties, or prevent the shedding of blood. He has even followed heathen parties to the remote district of Taranaki, who have gone on expeditions of blood, to prevent their killing and eating the people; and not unfrequently brought them home, having succeeded in defeating their object. In this way he has made some little restitution for his former deeds of cruelty. He embraced Christianity about eighteen years ago, and has had a missionary living with him for at least fifteen years. He is much respected among the tribes, and exerts a most salutary influence through the Waikato district."—P. 200.

Mr. Young testifies to a high degree of intellectual capacity on the part of the New-Zealanders. Their quickness shows itself especially in eloquence—the common gift of higher races in their earlier stages of development. Speech-making is with them as with our own American people, a staple article of enjoyment, both for speakers and hearers. "A New-Zealand audience listens to the speaker with the utmost attention; nor is there any chance of his meeting with interruption; on the contrary, he will be listened to in the most profound silence, so long as he may continue to address them. To make up for the want of a platform, which obtains for our speakers the better attention of the audience, the New-Zealand orator secures an opening in the assembly, so as to permit him to advance and retreat for the space of ten or twelve yards. A sentence is delivered while he advances, ample room being thus given for all the energy and effect which the united powers of mind and muscular exertion can accomplish; and when he retreats he finds

time to arrange his thoughts, as well as to obtain a temporary rest for his muscles. In this way they continue alternately advancing and retreating until they have exhausted their ideas. When their speech is of much importance, every sentence is repeated."

Perhaps there is no greater bigot on earth than a thorough-bred Puseyite priest of the Church of England. Most of us have had occasion to smile at the Chinese exclusiveness of these people in our own land; but when the same spirit is manifested in heathen lands, at the peril of immortal souls too ignorant to detect imposture, it is matter for grief and sadness rather than ridicule. For many years the Wesleyan and Episcopal missionaries worked together in entire harmony; but the arrival of the Puseyite "Bishop of New-Zealand" some years ago was the signal for discord and strife. This unhappy man (who is now, we believe, enjoying himself in England—long may he stay there) very soon "astonished the natives with the (to them) unheard-of assertions, that the Wesleyans were a 'crooked branch,' a 'fallen people,' and that they had no 'Scriptural ministers;' that they were 'schismatics,' their 'ordination invalid,' and their baptisms at most the 'acts of laymen.' One of the bishop's missionaries rebaptized several parties previously baptized by Wesleyan missionaries, marking them with the 'sign of the cross,' and had thereupon admitted them to partake of the Lord's supper, seeing that 'now their baptism was complete.' The missionaries in a letter to the bishop complained of this, but no remedy was provided against its repetition, as the offending individual continued the practice. Disastrous results followed. Perhaps one part of the family had been baptized into the Episcopalian, another into the Wesleyan Church. The bishop appeared among them, telling them that they must no longer worship together, but separately; that the teachers of the one party were no longer to be allowed to instruct the other; that they were a distinct communion, and that all the distinctions of the Church were to be rigorously observed. And what was the effect? Why the Scripture was literally fulfilled, that 'a man's foes shall be they of his own household;' and the fearful spectacle was seen of father and son, mother and daughter, hating and opposing each other."

Mr. Whiteley, a missionary of eleven years' standing, was forbidden by the natives (acting under the direction of his "lordship") from preaching in a village which absolutely owed its erection to himself, and among people whose lives he himself had saved in a native war! The result is, that instead of regular Christian teaching, these natives get no European instruction, except what they may imperfectly derive from the quarterly and half-yearly visits of

Church ministers, who as yet are unable to address them in their own language.

The following account of the cession of New-Zealand to the British crown is quite *apropos* to certain proceedings now going on in the Sandwich Islands :—

> "On the fifth of February, 1840, it was proposed, at a great meeting held at the Waitangi, that the rights and powers of sovereignty over the whole of New-Zealand Islands should be ceded to Her Majesty the Queen of England. This proposition, so novel and startling, elicited determined and violent opposition. The speeches of the opposers were clever and impressive; and Her Majesty's representative began to fear for the result, when, behold, Tamati Waka stepped forward. He had been instructed, gained, and baptized by the Wesleyan missionaries; and now, in a strain of natural and powerful eloquence that surprised the Europeans, he subdued the opposition, and removed the unfavourable impressions of the previous speakers. Addressing his countrymen first, he called upon them to remember the degraded position in which they had formerly been, and how much their character had become exalted by their intercourse with Europeans. He reminded them that they could not govern themselves without frequent wars and bloodshed; and he advised them to receive the British as their rulers, and to place confidence in their promises. Having thus done his duty to his countrymen, the noble chief then turned to the queen's representative, on whose gratitude he had established such claims, and, appealing to him as a witness of what had passed, said, 'You must now be our father. You must not allow us to be enslaved. You must preserve our customs, and never permit our lands to be wrested from us.' The die was cast. New-Zealand became a portion of the British empire."—P. 207.

We do not know that any Methodist minister will be concerned either in forwarding or consummating the marriage between the Sandwich Islands and the United States; but, whether or no, we hope that our British friends, imitating our conduct in the case of New-Zealand, will not forbid the banns.

The FRIENDLY ISLANDS contain a population of about 30,000, according to Mr. Young's estimate. A Wesleyan mission was begun in Tonga in 1822; and now almost the entire population is under the influence of Christianity. "It is true that all have not been savingly converted; neither do they observe all the obligations of the Christian religion: but 7,000 are the accredited members of the Wesleyan Church; 7,279 children and adults, in 185 schools, are receiving education; 8,000 of the people, at least, can read, and many more are learning to do so; while 5,000 can also write, and, in many cases, even elegantly. Throughout the islands the Wesleyans have 109 chapels, 527 local preachers, and several catechists, and other native agents. This work, as a whole, accomplished in a quarter of a century, is, perhaps, unequalled since the days of the apostles. It is "a nation born at once."

Mr. Young devotes a large part of his volume to the interesting

Friendly islanders; but, for the reason above-mentioned, we shall not follow him at length. We are so much struck, however, with the "King of Tonga," as he appears in Mr. Young's pages, that we must make our readers better acquainted with him. This "Christian king" and "devoted Methodist preacher," is described as a fine, manly person, with a powerful frame, and an intelligent and thoughtful countenance. Though rich in goods and power, King George's wardrobe is not of the completely imperial sort; for when Mr. Young invited him to take a voyage to Sydney in the mission-ship "John Wesley," the slight difficulty occurred that his only pair of trousers were at Haabai, some ninety miles off. But if the royal wardrobe was deficient, the larder was amply stored: when the ship was getting her stores ready, he sent aboard, as provisions for the voyage, five and a half tons of yams, fifteen hundred and forty-eight pounds of pork, upward of two thousand cocoa-nuts, and nearly six hundred fowls!

A dinner, sent from the royal table as a present to Mr. Young, consisted of six large native puddings, four baskets of *taro*, sundry cocoa-nuts, and two baked hogs! And the man's heart was as large as his gifts. Mr. Young had abundant opportunity of testing this reclaimed savage during three months at Tonga and on the voyage to Australia; and, in all that time, found nothing inconsistent with his profession as a Christian and a minister; but, on the contrary, everything to admire, both in his manliness of mind and character and religious life. What an example for a converted heathen chief and his wife to set before their people is shown in the following passage:—

"*Oct. 23d.*—Sabbath in Tongatabu. At half-past five o'clock, A. M., the bell of the chapel summoned the inhabitants to worship. It was a meeting for prayer, and attended by about three hundred persons. The king and queen were present, and both engaged in prayer. The former took a review of God's mercies to them as a people, contrasting their present with their former condition, noticing the arrival of missionaries, together with the Book of God in their own tongue; and describing in grateful language, and with much hallowed feeling, the happy results they had realized. He then referred to my arrival, and spoke of it as a further evidence of the love of God, and of the Christians in England, to him and his people. And the 'John Wesley' having brought several cases of the New Testament, he also alluded to that as a very great boon bestowed upon them: and when he thanked God that the cases had arrived, were in the bay, and would soon be landed, there was from every part of the chapel a burst of joyous feeling. The Scriptures are so valued in these islands that a sovereign would not have purchased a copy of the New Testament before our arrival. Many possessed the holy treasure, but esteemed it more precious than gold, yea, than much fine gold, and would on no account part with it. The queen, in her prayer, also gave thanks for the arrival of the Scriptures, and said the book was valuable, not because of its paper and ink, but because it brought good tidings to sinners, and from

> Genesis to Revelation was full of the Saviour. And when she in a tremulous, but earnest and melodious voice, thanked God for his book, the response from every part of the chapel told that she had touched a tender chord, and elicited the grateful feelings of many a heart."—P. 215.

In the group called the FEEJEES there are one hundred and fifty islands, of which above one hundred are inhabited. The population is estimated at about 200,000. The Wesleyan Mission in these islands was commenced in 1835; and although its results have not equalled those reached in the Friendly Islands, they have been wonderful, considering the terrible character of the people. There are now in Feejee ninety-two chapels and preaching-places, one hundred and six native teachers and local preachers, two hundred and forty-four class-leaders, more than three thousand Church members, and four thousand scholars.

That the Feejeeans were cannibals is well known; but it is not so generally understood that they are still such, when not under the influence of Christianity. Mr. Young learned that the evil was daily practised in some parts of the country; that a victim was sometimes put into the oven alive, at other times mutilated, and made not only to witness the cooking of his own flesh, but also to feed upon it; that men sometimes killed, cooked, and ate their own wives; and on one occasion, very recently, at Tokai, on the island of Ovalau, four miles from the mission-house, a man killed his wife, and, fearful to relate, mutilated the body, and filled two baskets with the parts; and, as his helpless child that stood by, witnessing the horrid operation, began to cry, he sought to soothe the sorrowful one, by offering a portion of the mother's flesh, saying, "Take that, and bake it."

Some of Mr. Young's statements are, if possible, still more fearful:—

> "Joel Bulu, who has extensive knowledge of the Feejeeans, informed me he knew a man who told his wife to gather some sticks, and she did so; he then directed her to heat the oven; and on that being done, she inquired where the food was that he intended to be cooked; when the brutal, fiendish man, replied, 'You are the food!' He then clubbed her, and placed her in the oven. Joel said the man was still alive. All these cases of cannibalism were of very recent occurrence. * * * It is everywhere prevalent, except in the few places where Christianity has been embraced,—there it is entirely extinct. The missionaries have never known an instance of a professing Christian eating human flesh. They believe the case never occurs. Whatever else Christianity may do for this degraded, yet interesting people, it wipes this stain from their character. 'I believe,' says one of the missionaries, 'not less than five hundred persons have been eaten within fifteen miles of my residence, during the last five years; but no Christian has tasted the horrid morsel. Indeed, they never think of such a thing, as far as we can learn.' The Feejeeans are undoubtedly among the vilest cannibals. Many of them have assured our missionaries that they greatly prefer human flesh to any other

> animal food; and those who have abandoned it cannot but speak in the same tone of its superior excellence as an article of food. It is common among them, when they see a fine man, to say, 'What fine eating that man would be!' in the same way that we should speak of an ox. It is quite a mistake to suppose that they eat human flesh merely from revenge. Many of them have only one reason, namely, because they prefer it to other food; others eat it from pride; others, no doubt, in time of war, from revenge. It is positively affirmed by the natives themselves, that, in some parts of Navetelavu, the people eat raw human flesh, and even chew it in their mouths, as sailors do tobacco. Sometimes a man is cooked whole, and brought to the chief with a wig and a head-dress on, in a sitting posture, with a club, or something of the kind, in his hand, so that in the distance he can scarcely be distinguished from a living being. On some occasions they eat their own friends. If a fine young man is shot in war, his own party will secure him, if possible: they will have a mock funeral, and bury him; then dig him up in the night, and eat him. This, however, I believe, is not common. The priests at Bau are not allowed to eat human flesh. Women sometimes eat it; and they take a pleasure in greasing the mouths of little children with a portion of it, to prevent a disease to which they are subject. Some districts in the group do not eat human flesh, for the same reasons that some will not eat fowls, fish, &c.,—these things being the shrine of their god, in which he is supposed to reside when not in 'Bulu,' the world of spirits. Sometimes a man is mutilated, and cooked by piecemeal, while still alive; and instances have been known of a part of the body being cut off, and the person himself being obliged to eat it. Seru cut a man up by piecemeal, and roasted the pieces on the coals, and, shocking to relate, ate them in the poor fellow's presence; and the late King of Rawa cut off the arm of one of his servants, and compelled her to eat a part of it! 'We know,' says one of the missionaries, 'that these are both facts;' they are not, however, common occurrences; but I could state worse, very much worse things than these, that have occurred in this land of darkness and blood; but I dare not write them, they are too horrible to be told."—Pp. 309–311.

Here, as in the Friendly Islands, Romish priests have introduced themselves; and their influence, so far as good is concerned, is, perhaps, a little worse than that of the Puseyite bishop of New-Zealand. Mr. Young gives some amazing specimens of the spontaneous adroitness with which the native preachers sometimes foil the priests. A priest at Tolongo tried to convince one of these native agents that he would lose his soul among the Wesleyans; but failing with the man, he tried his eloquence on the preacher's wife, in his absence. He went at once to the priest, and informed him that he understood he had been to see his wife, which was certainly very like the serpent going to Eve when Adam was out of the way, and that he had now come to hear anything the priest might wish to say to *him*. After answering many questions, the native teacher requested permission to ask the priest *one* question. "How is it," said he, "that a priest in your Church has not a wife?" The priest replied, "Has God a wife?" This question, bordering on profanity, was doubtless designed as a poser; but it failed to be so, for the native promptly replied, "Does God eat? If you are gods, or claim to be as God, be consistent throughout. If it be because God has no wife, that

you have not one, do not eat, because God does not eat; do not drink, because God does not drink; do not live in a house, because God does not live in a house; do not wear clothes, because God does not wear them: be as God throughout!" This was indeed answering a fool according to his folly. Still better is the following:—

> "It appears that about two years ago there was a gracious revival of religion at Lakemba. Many of the young people were convinced of sin, and some of them cried out because of the disquietude of their souls. This circumstance was seized upon by one of the Romish priests, who, under pretence of deep interest in the welfare of the young people, urged the king to put a stop to the revival, lest they should all go deranged; 'for,' said he, 'this is the work of the devil.' 'Well,' said Twineyau, 'I am not much acquainted with such things, neither do I pretend to be a teacher of priests; but, to my mind, that which you say is the work of the devil, looks very much like what took place on the day of Pentecost, when those pricked in their heart said to Peter and the rest of the apostles, "Men and brethren, what shall we do?"' Well might one of the priests say, as he is reported to have said, 'We came too late to these islands: we ought to have been here before the Scriptures.'"—P. 284.

A very important question, with regard to missionary operations in general, is asked and answered in the following passage:—

> "Can any measures be taken to civilize the natives, before they embrace Christianity? I think not. 'We have not been able to succeed in any degree in improving the condition of the people,' says one of our missionaries, 'excepting so far as we have been the means of their conversion. We cannot even persuade them to send their children to school, until they have abandoned heathenism. They can see no use for education, except for religious purposes, and oppose this first step to civilization on the ground of its being unnecessary. The same remarks will apply to decent clothing. One of the great objections the heathen in these parts have to Christianity is, that the persons professing it wear a decent dress, instead of the mere apology for one which *they* wear. The natives, however, soon acquire a taste for civilization, when they have abandoned heathenism; but until then they dislike anything that is not Feejeean.' They will conform to the customs of others on board a vessel, or in the house of a missionary; but they would have a strong objection against adopting those customs as their own. I believe, from all I have heard and seen, that no impression of a really favourable kind can be made upon them by anything except Christianity, and this is of course a powerful motive to the missionaries to do what they can to induce them to embrace the gospel. It is not one among many ways of doing them good,—it is the only way to be relied on. Commerce may improve them; but then it depends on the way it is conducted. One ship will raise them a little from their degradation; another, by sanctioning many of their present evil habits, will sink them lower. 'We have not seen,' says another of our missionaries, 'the good effects of foreigners residing among the natives. However long they reside, they leave them much the same as they found them.'"—P. 313.

Our last extract from this interesting volume contains Mr. Young's mature views upon the results of his mission, and upon the prospects of Methodism in Australia and Polynesia, under its new and independent organization.

"Australia is doubtless designed to occupy a prominent position in the world's future history, and to become the centre of light in the southern hemisphere. The Australian Wesleyans being aware of this, are evincing an earnest and noble solicitude to increase the number of their faithful ministers, that Wesleyanism may take its full share in giving a Christian impress to the institutions, and in directing the destinies of this great country. Many of them are wealthy, and are also liberal. During the last twelve months, in addition to contributions in support of local objects, they have contributed £1,950 toward the outfit and passage of additional ministers, besides upward of £3,000 to the funds of the Parent Society; and I am happy to say that on the Wesleyan Churches in Australia being formed into a distinct, though affiliated connexion, they will cheerfully undertake to support all their ministers, maintain their own institutions, and contribute a handsome sum annually for purely missionary purposes.

"It has sometimes been said that the British Conference will sacrifice the cause of Christ, rather than part with any of its power. That witness is not true. It possesses power in Australasia and Polynesia, legitimately obtained, and hitherto wisely exercised, but now proposes to give up that power. And why? Not as the result of any pressure from without, for there has been none; nor yet at the request of the parties concerned, for no such request has been made; but simply because it believes that the time has arrived when it can transfer its power to other hands with advantage to the cause of religion; thus subordinating its power to the interests of the Redeemer's kingdom,—a principle upon which, as I believe, it invariably endeavours to act, whatever may be said to the contrary.

"This arrangement will invest our mission Churches in Australasia and Polynesia with great responsibility; and some have anxiously inquired, Are they sufficiently qualified to undertake that responsibility? I believe they are. But are the ministers not too juvenile to occupy a position so important? I think they are not. In Australia alone there are nineteen ministers who have sustained the sacred office from eighteen to thirty-three years; and there are several others in New-Zealand and Polynesia of equal standing. Comparison here would be improper; but there are ministers in these regions, of deep piety, ardent zeal, sober judgment, noble enterprise, and considerable mental power, equal to any emergency that may arise; and among whom will doubtless be found the Thompsons, Barbers, Pawsons, and Mathers of the Australasian connexion. Nor is there any lack of enlightened and able laymen to coöperate with the ministers in rendering the contemplated arrangement a blessing to the Southern World. I have no fear lest they should betray the generous confidence about to be reposed in them, or disappoint the expectation formed of their ability to manage their own affairs."—Pp. 403, 404.

We take our leave of this unpretending volume with increased respect for its author's head and heart; and with renewed admiration of the zeal, fidelity, and success with which the Wesleyans of England have prosecuted the work of Christian missions in pagan lands. When the "ransomed of the Lord shall return and come to Zion," multitudes shall rise up from the far-off isles of the sea to "call them blessed,"—the devoted and heroic men who have sacrificed all that civilized life holds dear, and often life itself, in order to carry the name of CHRIST to the ends of the earth.

Art. VII.—SHORT REVIEWS AND NOTICES OF BOOKS.

(1.) Our stock of geographical and statistical information is always growing, and there is constant need of new works to keep us "up with the times." Every few years new maps, new charts, and new gazetteers are needed: the old ones become like yesterday's newspaper, only valuable historically. We welcome, therefore, most heartily, the appearance of "*Harper's Statistical Gazetteer of the World, with Special Reference to the United States and British America,*" (1855, 8vo.,) of which we have received six numbers. In preparing this book, the editor (Mr. J. C. Smith) has employed not only the existing manuals of the subject, but also the latest sources of information including the most recent censuses made in both hemispheres, and also the newest books of geography, travels, and statistics. The work is to be completed in ten numbers, and illustrated by seven maps prepared expressly for it. It will be *the* Gazetteer of the age.

◆

(2.) The most highly-finished gift-book for the coming year that we have seen, is "*Jerusalem and its Vicinity*, by the Rev. W. H. Odenheimer, A. M." (Philadelphia: E. H. Butler & Co., 1855; 12mo., pp. 218.) The text consists of a series of familiar lectures, on "the sacred localities connected with the week before the resurrection," delivered by Mr. Odenheimer to his congregation, and describing his own personal impressions of a visit to the Holy Land. With these are interwoven the reflections proper to a Christian congregation, in contemplating the scenes and the times of our Master's sufferings and triumph. Mr. Odenheimer has a greater fund of credulity with regard to the traditions of Palestine than we can boast of; and certain veins of thought in his lectures adapt them rather to an Episcopal congregation than to any other: but there is a great deal of beauty in his descriptions, and much piety in his aims. The work is finely illustrated by steel plates.

◆

(3.) "*The Nemesis of Power*, by James A. St. John" (1854; 18mo., pp. 254) is an attempt at unfolding the causes and forms of revolutions. Mr. St. John believes that the future history of the world, during many centuries, will be little but a record of civil contests. A bitter hater of arbitrary power, he selects its worst abuses and disgraces, and crowds them into his small canvas with terrible effect. He hates the Church of Rome with the most cordial hatred, too; holding it as the great abettor of despotism throughout the world. He believes the English constitution to be the model of a free state,—complicated, indeed, and incomplete, yet advancing constantly toward perfection.

◆

(4.) Messrs. Appleton & Co. have reprinted "*Russia, translated from the French of the Marquis de Custine.*" (1854; 12mo., pp. 499.) Its reissue at the present crisis cannot but be acceptable, as the work is, in many respects,

the best description of Russian society, especially in the higher classes, that has yet appeared. The present edition leaves out some unessential details—personal to M. Custine—but all that is substantial in his graphic descriptions and easy narrative is retained.

* * *

(5.) "*Memoirs of Celebrated Characters*, by ALPHONSE DE LAMARTINE." (New-York: Harper & Brothers, 1854; 2 vols., 12mo.) M. Lamartine has found his *forte;* he is eminently a writer of sketches; he writes history but it is history in portraits and pictures. The work before us is the first in which he has really given play to his proper powers to the fullest extent. His object is to exhibit the human race in action; to illustrate history by exhibiting the great men and great deeds, the deep shadows and great lights, the great perversities and high moral perfections of the race.

"Now to give the general reader this exhibition of the human race in action, it is not necessary, as it might be supposed, to evoke a multitude of historic names and personages from the catacombs of literature. No: the human is vast, but not infinite. A hundred principal actors, at most, are sufficient to represent, under the pen of the historian, the drama, sometimes varied, but oftener uniform, of human vicissitudes. Everything depends on a judicious choice of characters.

"There are also two ways of choosing them. They may be selected in respect to the greatness or importance of their conventional rank in the world, the nobility of their race, the brilliancy of their reign, the immensity of their empire, the magnificence of their title, the multitude of their subjects, or the prowess of their armies. On the other hand, they may be chosen in regard to their natural ability, the extent of their ideas, the influence which their appearance exercised upon human intellect, the greatness of the personal part they acted, the holiness of their lives upon earth, their labours, their persecutions, and sometimes their death; for such is often their only reward for the truths they brought into the world. They must especially be selected for the epic or dramatic interest of their lives. In this point of view, the more one of these great actors of the drama of existence has been maligned, the more unhappy he is, the more he is persecuted, the more there is of toil, vicissitude, tears, and blood in his history, the more there is also of interest, love, passion, and devotion in the feeling of posterity toward him, and the more strongly he impresses himself on the imagination. From this point of view in the human heart, which is that of the masses, Socrates is more historical than Alexander, Christopher Columbus than Charles the Fifth, Torquato Tasso than the Medici, or than Francis the First.

"These are the characters we have sought out for our biographies. We do not lose sight of the immense ascendency given by rank, royalty, military power, or hereditary dynastic authority to the leaders of nations and shepherds of the people in modern times. An exalted destiny is the foundation of a high influence. The same natural abilities which, when placed by fortune at the bottom of the scale, only shine for a narrow circle in the mediocrity of common life, illumine the whole human race when Providence places them on high. A great idea dies unborn in an obscure man without power, while it produces great results in one who sits upon a throne. We must be blind or envious to deny this truth. A man's social position is one of the conditions of his action on his fellows. Rank is an initiation to glory. When we have met with personal valour in sovereigns or royal legislators, we give them the first place in history; but when we have seen in other, obscure ranks of life, men, superior in themselves, but usually neglected, or placed in the lowest ranks by distributers of fame—as, for instance, prophets, philosophers, poets, orators, historians, artists, artisans, martyrs to a faith, useful in the world—we have restored to these naturally great men the position, which of right belongs to them, among the

masters and models of our race. History, in our opinion, is like Michael Angelo's Last Judgment, in which people appear before God, not in their own costume, but in that of nature."

The sketch of Nelson strikes us as the best in the series; the only drawback upon it is the levity with which the crimes of the great captain are treated.

(6.) "*The City Side: or, Passages from a Pastor's Portfolio*," (Boston: Phillips, Sampson & Co.; 18mo., pp. 297,) is a picture of the bright side of clerical life in America. It shows aptly, however, that the bright and dark shades are thrown in, to no small degree, by the character and habits of the minister himself; that the man is as much as, or more than, the circumstances.

(7.) MOST of the English writers on religious topics are troubled with the disease of prolixity. We cannot entirely exonerate from this charge "*Scenes in the Life of St. Peter*, by the Rev. DANIEL WEST," (London: A. Heylin, pp. 380;) but some excuse may be found in the fact that the volume consists of a series of lectures delivered by the author in the regular course of his ministry, without reference to publication. The substance of the lectures, moreover, as well as their dress, is much better than the common run of such writings: the book is Scriptural in doctrines, graphic in description, and pungent in exhortation. It deserves reprinting here.

(8.) MR. M. W. DODD has reprinted, in a neat duodecimo, (pp. 276,) Dr. Cumming's "*Manual of Bible Evidence for the People*." As we have before commended the book on its merits, it is now only necessary for us to announce the reprint.

(9.) MESSRS. CARTER & BROTHERS offer us, in a neat and handsome form, a new edition of Duncan's "*Sacred Philosophy of the Seasons*," (4 vols., 12mo., 1855.) To those who are acquainted with this excellent work no commendation of ours is needed: to those who are not, it may suffice to say that the four volumes form a series, the object of which is to demonstrate the existence and the attributes of God in the various phenomena of Spring, Summer, Autumn, and Winter. The matter is distributed into brief heads marked for daily readings. The work thus forms an admirable companion series to Jay's "Morning and Evening Exercises;" the one illustrating the relations of man to God from the book of nature, as the other does from the book of revelation.

(10.) M. COUSIN has entered upon a work the most foreign, as he himself says, to his ordinary labours. It is nothing less than an illustration of French life, in court and convent, during the seventeenth century: the first instalment of which is offered in "*The Youth of Madame de Longueville*, translated by F. W. Ricord." (New-York: D. Appleton & Co., 1854; 12mo., pp. 402.) M.

Cousin does not pretend to write the life of this fairest of the race of Conde; her history has been given, formally and informally, often enough before; but he aims to unfold more of the causes of things—to reveal the springs of life more intimately—than the gossipping French *Memoirs* are ever wont to do. Certainly the book is admirable as a picture of the most brilliant French society in one of its most brilliant periods; but it is also, we are sorry to say, a revelation, on M. Cousin's part, of a want of that delicate as well as stern moral sense which discerns vice as clearly and rebukes it as strongly in lace as in rags.

(11.) "*Kanzas and Nebraska, with Directions to Emigrants*, by EDWARD E. HALE." (Boston: Phillips, Sampson & Co., 1854; 12mo., pp. 256.) This timely work offers, perhaps, as good an account as could be given at present of the history, geography, and physical position of the territories of Kanzas and Nebraska. It is furnished also with an original map, from the latest authorities, and of a brief account of the societies recently established to aid emigration to the new territories. The information here given is general rather than special; but a minute knowledge of the country has yet to be acquired. It is to be hoped that the book will contribute its share to nullify the plan of the present American government to spread slavery over the vast territory covered by what is known as the "Nebraska Bill."

(12.) ONE of the best books on hygiene, diet, regimen, &c., that we have ever seen, is "*Preservation of Health and Prevention of Disease*, by B. N. COMINGS, M. D." (New-York: D. Appleton & Co., 1854; 12mo., pp. 208.) The work is not a treatise on family medicines, but offers a practical and common-sense view of the causes of disease, with the simplest and best means of avoiding it by good habits of life. It contains also a clear account of so much of physiology as is necessary for *everybody* to know in order to live with a reasonable prospect of health. The plates by which this part of the work is illustrated are remarkably well done.

(13.) CHRYSOSTOM is, perhaps, of all the Church fathers, the one in regard to whose life and character there exists the least of partisan feeling. His was so eminently a practical character, that dogmatists find comparatively little in his writings to dispute about. Often as his life has been written, both in the Church history and in separate monographs, we have yet had no good biography extant, in English, adapted to popular reading—the translation of Neander's Chrysostom being yet unfinished. The want is now supplied by the "*Life of Chrysostom, translated from the German* of F. M. PERTHES, by A. Hovey and D. B. Ford." (Boston: Jewett & Co.; 12mo., pp. 239.) The work, in the words of the author, is neither a romance, nor a history in the form of a romance, but a simple effort to exhibit the true facts in the life of Chrysostom, with their relation to the times in which he lived. We have not the original at hand, and therefore cannot speak of the fidelity of the translation; but it does not run as smoothly as such a narrative should.

(14.) THE Sunday-School Union, under Dr. Kidder's direction, is reprinting an admirable series of short stories from history, originally published by the English "Society for the Promotion of Christian Knowledge." We have before us the "*Stories from the History of England, Italy, France and Mexico*," each in a neat 18mo. volume, and commend them as prepared in the best and most skilful method for children's books. They have all the interest of fiction without its risks; attracting young readers by graphic narratives—the only reading that really *does* attract them—and stimulating their tastes for wider and closer historical study. With more than ordinary earnestness, we commend these volumes to the notice of parents and Sunday-school teachers.

(15.) THERE is no more satisfactory index of the public taste than the lists of new books. The announcements of holyday presents for the present season show that the people have got beyond the old standard of "Annuals," filled with vapid verse and stupid stories. Better still, most of the books now offered, especially those of the highest class, are illustrations of the Bible, or of the Bible lands. One of the most excellent of them all, both as to its form and matter, is "*The Parables of the New Testament Practically Unfolded*, by the Rev. W. BACON STEVENS, D. D." (Philadelphia: E. H. Butler & Co.; 8vo., pp. 336.) While Dr. Stevens has wisely avoided any display of critical learning in his expositions, they bear evident marks of resting, in the main, on a basis of scientific study; and at the same time they bring out the practical lessons of the parables with great clearness, and enforce them with the most evangelical earnestness. In outward execution the volume is superb; its admirable typography, artistical illustration, and beautiful binding, are highly creditable to the publishers. No better Christian "gift-book" than this could be devised or desired.

(16.) "*Synonyms of the New Testament*, by the Rev. R. C. TRENCH." (New-York: Redfield, 1854; 12mo., pp. 250.) This volume contains the substance of a course of lectures delivered by Mr. Trench at King's College. Like his book on "Words," and on "Proverbs," it is suggestive rather than systematic and popular in form, though resting on a scientific groundwork of study. There is no accessible book extant on the subject, except a poor translation of Tittmann; and although this treatise goes but a short way into the subject, it will be very acceptable to all earnest students of the original text of the New Testament.

(17.) MISS SEWELL'S stories all bear the charm of naturalness of manner, though they are prolix often to tiresomeness; and some of them are so plainly proselyting in their aim as to detract from their general usefulness. From this latter fault, "*Katharine Ashton*" (New-York: D. Appleton & Co.; 2 vols., 12mo.) is almost entirely free; it is only here and there that the sectarian

prejudice of the writer peeps out. The book is an admirable lesson of Christian patience, submission, and self-denial.

(18.) MESSRS. CARTER & BROTHERS have done good service to the Church and to society, in printing a cheap edition of "PEARSON'S Prize Essay on Infidelity," (18mo., pp. 628.) By the use of small type and a compact page, they have condensed the *whole* of this valuable work into a small 18mo., which they offer at a very low price, (sixty cents.) We hope it will be placed in the hands of every reading man (old or young) in this country.

(19.) "*Jeanie Morrison*" (New-York: Carter & Brothers, 1855; pp. 348) is the story of an orphan girl, who was adopted by a kind family, became a good Christian, suffered many misfortunes, kept her hold on Christ, and was happy at last. It may be safely placed in the hands of children; indeed, it is far above the average of story books, both in its religious value and literary merit.

(20.) To write a sustained allegory is a task requiring the highest genius. We cannot say that "*The Emigrants*, by the Rev. WESLEY COCHRAN," (Auburn: W. J. Morris, 12mo., pp. 191,) is successful *as* an allegory; but it is a pleasant book to read, and abounds in religious instruction.

(21.) "*The Seven Wonders of the World and their Associations.*" (New-York: Carlton & Phillips, 1854; 12mo., pp. 300.) In this volume will be found a summary of the fragmentary statements that exist in old books about the marvels of the ancient world, known by the designation of the title-page. It gives also whatever may be found in the accounts of modern travellers to confirm these older statements, and brings together, under the head of "associations," a number of interesting historical and mythological illustrations. In this way a very pleasing and instructive book is made out of very scanty materials.

(22.) "*The Poetry of Germany*, by ALFRED BASKERVILLE." (New-York: Garrigue; 12mo., pp. 664.) This volume contains selections from upward of seventy of the most celebrated poets, translated into English verse, with the original text in the opposite page. As the work aims at giving a complete outline of modern German poetry, it necessarily contains many specimens that have been before translated; but, in the main, Mr. Baskerville's version will compare favourably with even those of his most eminent predecessors. Conceiving, justly, that the only perfect translation is that which preserves, as far as possible, at once the letter, the form, and the spirit of the original, he has preserved the German metres, even at the expense, occasionally, of some degree of literalness in the version. To all students of German, as well as to all admirers of German poetry, the book will be a welcome gift.

(23.) The newspapers have from time to time given reports of a new art—that of fish-breeding—as cultivated successfully in France. The French government has taken hold of the subject; and the inquiries made under its direction have shown that we can as well enliven our rivers and watercourses with fish as we can cover the fields with grain. Several books upon the methods and prospects of this new art have appeared in France and England; but we have had no reprints of them, and no original or compiled work on it till the appearance of "*A Complete Treatise on Artificial Fish-breeding, translated and edited by* W. H. Fry." (New-York: D. Appleton & Co., 1854; 12mo., pp. 188.) Mr. Fry has executed this task—as he does anything that he undertakes—thoroughly and conscientiously. The small volume here presented will be found to contain a summary of all that is valuable in the various works, official and other, that have appeared in Europe; and it is so clearly arranged and expressed that every farmer who has a watercourse in his vicinity may make use of its lessons.

◆

(24.) "*Lives of the Queens of England before the Norman Conquest*, by Mrs. Matthew Hall." (Philadelphia: Blanchard & Lea; 12mo., pp. 469.) These volumes present, as the preface states, the first connected outline of the history of royal women prior to the Norman conquest. If this be matter of credit to the author, she should by all means enjoy the fame; but we suspect shrewdly, that the reason why no one has undertaken the work up to this late date is that it was not worth doing at all. Those who are fond of legends may find pleasure in the book; for our own part we desiderate no more histories of "royal women," merely as such.

◆

(25.) "*Sermons designed for the Sick Room, Family Reading, and Village Worship*, by Jabez Burns, D. D." (London: Houlston & Stoneman, 1854; 12mo., pp. 435.) This volume contains sound advice and some good theology; but, like the other books from the same author that have fallen under our notice, it has no particular merit of thought or style to justify publication.

◆

(26.) The assailants of Christianity use all sorts of weapons—but very few of them are newly forged. The principal objections now made to the Gospel records—the discrepancies in the narratives, the apparent want of chronological accuracy, &c.—were made in almost the same form by the heathen opponents of Christianity in the first centuries, and have been repeated from age to age. One of the latest rehashes, seasoned with a very few novelties, is "*Christian Records*, by the Rev. Dr. Giles." (London: Whittaker, 1854; 8vo., pp. 300.) The book professes to be an historical inquiry concerning the age, authorship, and authenticity of the books of the New Testament; but it is, in fact, simply an attempt to invalidate their historical character entirely, while the writer professes to hold that Christian morality is wholly distinct from the

question of the divine origin of the Scriptures. His capacity for historical (!) investigations may be seen from an extract or two. He tells us that "even in England, a hundred years ago, the labours of Bishop Marsh led that learned divine to conclusions" almost heretical; yet Bishop Marsh died in 1839! We are informed, too, (p. 58,) that Justin Martyr, Irenæus, and Clement of Alexandria, lived at the end of the second century. And the man who uses "centuries" in this way is to fix for us *definitely* the dates of the apostolical epistles.

(27.) "*Party Leaders*, by J. G. BALDWIN." (New-York: D. Appleton & Co., 1855; 12mo., pp. 369.) The aim of this volume is partly historical and partly biographical. It contains sketches of Jefferson, Hamilton, Jackson, Randolph, and Clay—the representative men of American politics since 1800—and of course involves most of the great questions that have agitated the republic since the organization of parties. The author tells us that he has sought to perform his task "in entire freedom from all partisan bias;" a freedom not difficult to attain, now that the old party questions and the old parties themselves have passed, or are rapidly passing, into history. He does not attempt research into the sources of history, but aims merely to present its prominent facts in a form attractive "especially to young men;" and in this, too, he has succeeded well. His power of grouping is strong; he describes well; he tells a story well; indeed, he has some of the French aptitude for "memoir writing." At the same time he abounds too much in eulogy; the catalogue of laudatory adjectives is hardly abundant enough for his lavish praise.

(28.) MESSRS. CARTER & BROTHERS have reprinted "*The Autobiography of the Rev. William Jay, edited* by GEORGE REDFORD, D. D., and JOHN ANGELL JAMES," (New-York, 1855; 2 vols., 12mo.,) in a form much superior to that of the English edition, with the addition of much new matter. The work is divided into five parts, of which the first contains Mr. Jay's Autobiography; and the second a supplement, bringing the life down to its close. Part III. includes Mr. Jay's "Reminiscences of Distinguished Contemporaries; Part IV. is made up of selections from his correspondence; and Part V. his literary remains. This brief outline is enough to show how rich a store of information the volumes promise. No stronger testimony to Mr. Jay's excellence as a man, and as a minister, could be furnished, than the fact that he preached to the same congregation in Argyle chapel, Bath, from 1791 to 1853, a period of sixty-two years! In looking over this long pastoral relation he says:—

> "It is worthy of grateful acknowledgment, especially considering the restless and disorganizing times in which we have lived, and the discords and divisions in so many Churches, that the harmony of this religious interest has never been broken. Yet there have been considerable differences of judgment with regard to some measures, and of opinion with regard to some subjects; and we have not only had mixed communion, but have extended full membership, and even office-bearing, to our Baptist friends. Yet there has been no jar. 'The dipped and the sprinkled *have* dwelt in peace.' Bigotry on either side is not to be conquered by

bigotry on the other, but by an opposite disposition. This continued state of things is very honourable to the members and the deacons of the Church, and shows that *their* religion has reached the temper as well as the understanding, and inspired them with the meekness of wisdom to pursue 'things by which one may edify another.' Should it, in any degree, serve to commend the pastor, it may, perhaps, under God, be ascribed to his preferring influence to authority, and resolving to take no share in any party differences whatever."

(29.) "*Outlines of History*, by MARCIUS WILLSON." (New-York: Ivison & Phinney, 1854; 8vo., pp. 845.) This work is presented to the public in two forms,—the school edition and the university edition, of which we have seen only the latter. It is divided into three parts: Ancient History, (188 pp.,) Modern History, (410 pp.,) and the Philosophy of History, (245 pp.,) thus giving, in a single volume, a survey of the whole field, for the use of students. We have examined the work in part, and, so far as our scrutiny has gone, we find little in it to condemn except certain errors in orthography, for which, however, the author may perhaps plead Noah Webster's sanction. The style of the narrative is clear and often vigorous; the spirit of the work is Christian; the matter is well condensed, with judicious reference to the importance of the respective periods and events. The work is furnished with numerous geographical and historical notes and maps, which add greatly to its value as a textbook. A full index is still wanting to its completeness.

(30.) "*Elements of the Philosophy of the Human Mind*, by DUGALD STEWART, revised and abridged by FRANCIS BOWEN." (Boston: James Munroe & Co., 1854; 12mo., pp. 490.) It is well remarked by Professor Bowen, in the preface to this volume, that although Stewart has hardly attempted to solve the more abstruse and intricate problems of the Philosophy of Mind, he has done much to render it intelligible, popular, and useful. In the power of stating clearly whatever he himself had thoroughly grasped, no writer has ever excelled Stewart. Considered as a statement of the chief facts of psychology, this is an excellent text-book—perhaps the best that could be placed in the hands of college students; but as a *philosophy* of the human mind it has no peculiar merit.

(31.) WE have received, too late for adequate notice in this number of our journal, the "*History of the Origin, Formation, and Adaptation of the Constitution of the United States*, by GEORGE TICKNOR CURTIS." (New-York: Harper & Brothers, 1854; Vol. I, 8vo., pp. 518.) This first volume embraces the Constitutional History of the United States, from the commencement of the Revolution to the assembling of the Convention of 1787. It is naturally divided into three periods: First, to the adoption of the Articles of Confederation, in 1771; second, to the Peace of 1783; third, to the Federal Confederation of 1787. Thus the book treats of the darkest period of the history of the

country, and the period at the same time in which our state and national institutions were formed. The *wants* of the country gave birth to the Constitution; it was during the period above referred to that these wants became so obvious and so clamorous that the attempt to supply them could no longer be delayed. The second volume will treat of the process of forming the Constitution itself, as shown in the official records, and in Mr. Madison's debates. Such a work as this has long been a national desideratum; but at no time could it have been more acceptable than in the present period of political anarchy. We shall endeavour to do justice to the substance of the work, and to the doctrines it inculcates, more at length on the appearance of the second volume.

◆

(32.) Robert Carter & Brothers have brought out a new edition of "*Paley's Evidences of Christianity*, with Notes and Additions by Charles Murray Nairne, A. M.," (one volume, 12mo., pp. 501,) in bold, clear type, fair paper, and plain binding. The work needs no recommendation, for it is universally known, and is above all praise. It must continue to be a standard as long as there exist in the community a love of truth, and a capacity to appreciate sound arguments. The "additions" of Professor Nairne consist chiefly of an introductory essay on "the Claims of Divine Revelation," with a number of elaborate "Notes" on various topics discussed in the text. The edition is a good one, whether for a text-book or for the library.

◆

(33.) One of the most beautiful and useful publications that has been issued from the Methodist Book Concern is "*The Pictorial Catechism of the Methodist Episcopal Church.*" (New-York: Carlton & Phillips, 1855, square 8vo.) The volume contains the Catechism of the Church in its three forms, (No. 1, 2, and 3,) bound together. As a specimen of typography the book is almost faultless; it is lavishly illustrated with wood-cuts, executed and printed in the very best style of the art. Our views of this Catechism have been repeatedly given to our readers; we repeat our conviction that it is the best now extant in any of the Churches, and that it should be a household book in every Methodist family. In its present shape—its external attractions harmonizing with its excellent substance—it will be a most appropriate gift-book for the holidays.

◆

(34.) "*Morning and Evening Exercises*, by William Jay." (New-York: R. Carter & Brothers, 1854; 4 vols., 12mo.) This book is already so well known that it is almost needless to notice it, except for those who have grown up since the time of its first publication. As a book of daily readings for the closet or the family it remains without a rival. It treats of Christian doctrine, experience, and practice in the best way for edification, by deducing them

simply and directly from Scripture. Of all Mr. Jay's writings we consider these Exercises the best and the most useful.

◆

(35.) E. H. Butler & Co. (Philadelphia) have published a new and revised edition of "*The Scholar's Companion*, by Rufus W. Bailey," (1855, 12mo., pp. 310.) This well-known and very useful school-book will be more acceptable than ever in this improved form.

◆

(36.) The theory of verbal inspiration, though of comparatively recent origin in the history of theology, finds many warm supporters at the present day. We have before us a small but able treatise in favour of the doctrine, entitled "*Verbal Inspiration*, by the Rev. Joseph Baylee, D.D." (London: Seeleys, 1854; pp. 74.) It constitutes part of the course of Lectures on Exegesis delivered by Dr. Baylee, who is Principal of St. Aidan's Theological College, Birkenhead. It treats first of the nature of inspiration, then of the distinction between ordinary and extraordinary inspiration, in which the writer prepares the way for his thesis, that every word, and every syllable, and every letter of the Bible, is just what it would be had God spoken from heaven without any human intervention. He gives up the argument from a supposed necessity or a paramount utility, so strongly insisted on by several recent writers, and rests the case entirely upon the purpose of the Bible, its spotless purity, and the declarations of the inspired writers themselves; but he does not, in our judgment, succeed in making out his case. Verbal inspiration is a plausible theory, but not more so than that of the Church's infallibility, for which, indeed, it is in many minds a substitute.

◆

(37.) "*The Illustrated Natural History*, by the Rev. J. G. Wood, M. A., (New-York: Harper & Brothers, 1854; 12mo., pp. 524) is a classification of the mammals and birds, in the order of the Catalogue in the British Museum, with a brief account of the insects. Within these limits it is the best descriptive work on the subject, for young persons, that has fallen under our notice. It is illustrated by four hundred and fifty original designs, admirably engraved and printed.

◆

(38.) "*What, where, and who is Antichrist?*" (London: Bagsters; 12mo., pp. 63,) contains the substance of four lectures delivered during Lent, 1854, by the Rev. H. H. Beamish, AA. The author's conclusions are that the Roman empire is the seat of antichrist; that the Roman city is the metropolis or capital of his empire; that the Pope of Rome, wearing the triple crown, and claiming universal spiritual and temporal supremacy, is the "antichrist" *for the time being;* that his system of mock Christianity is the antichristianism *of the day*, and "the mother of harlots and abominations of the earth;" that the "antichrist"

yet to be revealed, "the man of sin," and "son of perdition," will be a full embodiment of all the distinguishing principles of the papacy; and be, moreover, in his mysterious personality, the counterparallel and infernal mimickry of "Emmanuel," an incarnation of him who conquered the first Adam, and who is emphatically described in his full-grown bestial form, as "the dragon, that *old* serpent, which is the devil and Satan." Rev. xx, 2. We do not think that his argument sustains these weighty conclusions.

(39.) "*The Elements of Agriculture*, by GEORGE E. WARING," (New-York: D. Appleton & Co., 1854; 12mo., pp. 288,) is the book for young farmers, and for old ones too. It treats clearly and briefly of the plant, the soil, of manures, of mechanical cultivation, and of the analysis of soils, in language at once scientific and intelligible. No farmer should be without this book and "Thomas's Farm Implements." It is a melancholy fact that the *majority* of the cultivators of the soil in America are working at a trade which they do not understand, because they have never learned it. The basis of thorough farming will be laid by every man who masters Mr. Waring's book. It is provided with questions for the use of schools.

(40.) "*Advanced Course of Composition and Rhetoric*, by G. P. QUACKENBOS, A. M." (New-York: D. Appleton & Co.; 12mo., pp. 450.) This work is intended as a sequel to the author's well-known "First Lessons in Composition," which has met with great favour among practical teachers. It is divided into five parts: First, the History of the English Language; second, Punctuation; third, Rhetoric; fourth, Prose Composition; and fifth, Poetical Composition. This comprehensive outline is so well filled up that the book deserves to be considered a thorough elementary manual on the topics named. We recommend it to the notice of all instructors of the better class.

(41.) "*Mary Dundas, or Passages in Young Life*," (New-York: R. Carter & Brothers, 1855; 18mo., pp. 299,) is a simple and beautiful story, designed to show that education and associations are insufficient, without fixed Christian principle, to prepare the young for the world's temptations. It may be safely placed in the hands of children, and will be sure at once to attract and instruct them.

(42.) "*Maxims of Washington, Political, Moral, Social, and Religious*, collected and arranged by J. F. SCHROEDER, D. D." (New-York: D. Appleton & Co., 1855; 12mo., pp. 423.) This book contains a golden treasure. There is no form in which the lessons of wisdom are so impressive and so diffusible as in aphorism; and many of the passages quoted here are worthy of that name in the best sense, from the terseness and point of the terms in which a single

weighty thought is conveyed. Dr. Schroeder's task has been well accomplished: we hope the book will become a *vade-mecum* for the young men of the land. If Young America were imbued with its deep political wisdom, and its high moral tone, we should have less fear for the future of the republic than has been habitual with us in these late years of political and private profligacy.

(43.) "*Tender Grass for Little Lambs*" (New-York: R. Carter & Brothers; square 12mo., pp. 255) illustrates temptation, repentance, redemption, and faith, by narrations adapted to the capacity of children. This is a second series by the same author, who succeeds better than most writers for children.

(44.) THE Unitarian view of human nature is, in many respects, very attractive. It cherishes high conceptions of the natural and social virtues which adorn our common humanity, and which are too often depreciated (apparently, at least) by the orthodox theory. Its error consists in rejecting the doctrine of depravity as inconsistent with the fact that unconverted men often exhibit beautiful manifestations of virtue, and this not spasmodically but consistently. That there is a difficulty here is unquestionable; and we have no doubt that many, not Unitarians, stumble at it continually. Books have been written to remove it; but none so good, that we have ever seen, as "*Natural Goodness*, by the Rev. T. F. R. MERCEIN." (New-York: Carlton & Phillips, 1854; 12mo., pp. 286.) The writer treats his subject with great logical skill, and at the same time with a moral sagacity and penetration even more admirable than his logic. Admitting to the full all that can be said in praise of the natural and social virtues, he shows that their existence and development is one of the *necessities of a state of probation*, and form, in fact, part of the divine plan of redemption to reach the depraved soul. This mode of presenting the subject is new to us; and it is, perhaps, one of the most striking and original features of a book which is throughout original and searching, to a degree rare in these days. We commend it most heartily to the attention of our readers; they will find it no commonplace repetition of old things, but a work of manly thought and noble aims. An extended review is in preparation for our April number.

(45.) IN no one branch of literature has there been greater improvement of late years, especially in America, than in classical text-books, for use in school and college. One of the best of these that has come under our notice is "*Herodoti Orientalia Antiquiora*, by H. M. JOHNSON, D. D." (New-York: D. Appleton & Co., 1854; 12mo., pp. 185.) The text comprises mainly such portions of Herodotus as give a connected history of the East to the fall of Babylon, and the death of Cyrus the Great. This selection is a very happy one, not merely from the new interest which recent events and discoveries have thrown

about the regions treated of, but also from the fact that the ground is not covered at all by the Greek and Roman writers commonly put into the hands of students. The general execution of the book is equal to the felicity of its conception. The text carefully follows the best editions, though Dr. Johnson does not hesitate to use his own judgment in all doubtful cases, giving the various readings in the notes. The notes are well adapted to the class of students for whom they are intended, avoiding bareness on the one hand and the more common fault of excessive explanation on the other. A novel feature is found in the historical and topographical remarks, which, instead of being scattered through the notes, are condensed into separate paragraphs at the end of each chapter. Many of these are, in fact, compact dissertations upon difficult points of history and chronology. The only fault we have to find with the work is an occasional carelessness and obscurity of style in the notes; but the blemish is *only* occasional. We commend the work to the scrutiny of instructors, confident that if they only give it a fair examination they will speedily put it into the hands of their students.

* * *

(46.) THE tenth volume of "*Harper's New Monthly Magazine*" commenced with the December number. Its circulation is now greater than ever, approaching rapidly, if we are rightly informed, to the vast number of one hundred and fifty thousand monthly. No thoughtful mind can fail to inquire anxiously into the kind of reading furnished to these multitudes. The youth of this generation—the grown men of the next—will carry with them into active life modes of thought and feeling, due, in no small degree, to the monthly visits of the Magazine. But what thoughts and what feelings? The contents of the Magazine are made up, the publishers tell us, "with constant reference to the wants and tastes of the great body of the American people, rather than those of any particular class or profession." This general statement is no doubt true: the first aim of the journal is popularity; and this aim it has achieved to an extent unparalleled in the history of periodical literature. But if it had no higher claim than this, it would get no commendation at our hands. There is one part of the Magazine, at least, which seeks not merely to gratify "the tastes of the American people," but to elevate and refine them. We refer to the *Editor's Table*, which has given, within the past year, a series of papers of the highest class, upon topics involving the profoundest, and at the same time the most practical questions of the age. The general drift of these papers is eminently conservative; but they abound in large views of life, in comprehensive grasp of great questions, and, most happily, in taking Christian ethics as the rule and law for man, both in public and in private stations. This single feature entitles the Magazine to a high rank among the educating influences of the country and the age. We have before spoken of certain features of the journal that do not, according to our notions, add to its character; and must again say that its semi-comic cuts and fashion plates seem to us sadly out of place in such a journal.

(47.) "GOERRES, *Gesammelte Werke*, herausgegeben von Marie Goerres." (Regensburg, 1854); "GOERRES, *ein Denkmal aus seinen Schriften auferbaut*." (Aachen, 1854); "SEPP, *Geschichte des Heidenthums*." (Regensburg, 1853, 3 vols.) JOSEPH VON GOERRES, who died a few years ago, was undoubtedly a man of remarkable energy and vast erudition. In his youth, a fiery politician, he despaired in later years of bringing on a reformation of society by means of politics; a prominent adherent of the first philosophic system of Schelling, he found in the abstruse speculations of German philosophy no elements adequate to content his restless spirit of investigation. He was then swept away by that current of conservative Catholic restorationism, which, in the early part of the present century, carried a number of German politicians, historians, and poets into the bosom of Romanism. Like most of them, Goerres never regarded Catholicism as it appears in the light of history, but invested it with all the brilliant features and colours of the *ideal* religio-political society which he had previously conceived in his own mind. Still, under the influence of his former studies, he went down to the deep grounds of mysticism to discover there a light in the darkness, which he had found besetting the sources of all sciences. He persuaded himself that he had made there a great discovery in finding new and wonderful relations between the fables and myths of paganism as a shadow, and Catholic Christianity as the full truth; between the myriads of mysteries in all sciences, and the Catholic doctrine as a key to disclose them. At the beginning and end of every science he posted a Catholic dogma as a watchman; by it he measured all the manifold inventions of our age, boldly pretending that everything true in them came from and pointed to a Catholic truth; and then he called upon the youths of his Church to rewrite from this standpoint the history of every science, since it had been too long monopolized and disfigured by Protestant erudition. All this, set forth in mystic, self-confident, and passionate language, could not fail to attract general attention on the part of his coreligionists. The influence of Goerres was so much the greater, as he made himself, at a critical moment, also the political champion of Romanism, principally through the "*historische-politische Blaetter*," of Munich, a periodical edited, although not under his name, yet under his guidance and controlling superintendence. We hazard nothing in saying that Goerres has done nearly as much for consolidating in Germany the forces of strict Romanism as all the Catholic episcopate together. His works, therefore, and books on his life will find within and beyond the boundaries of Germany a large circle of readers.

In one thing, however, Goerres was greatly disappointed. He found many readers, hearers, and admirers, but only a very few disciples. They could not master the sense of their teacher's words; a bad omen, indeed, for his anticipated dominion over the literature of the world. DR. SEPP is the single individual among his pupils who has distinguished himself. By attending Goerres's lectures for many years he learned to imitate his style, to follow him into the dark labyrinth of conjectures, to rival his aërial flights, and to get some hearing for himself in literary circles. His first work was a "Life of Jesus," in seven volumes, introduced by the master himself, and pretending to refute Strauss in a new and the only way possible. "The History of Paganism," whose full

title is given above, is his second work, valuable as a copious repository of Pagan mythology, but remarkable, at the same time, for the forcible and arbitrary contortions of facts, in order to discover a relation to the pretended truths of his Church.

(48.) THE *Rev. T. H. Stockton* has long stood in the first rank of preachers; but heretofore he has only been known from the fame of his discourses as spoken. We are now glad to welcome "*Sermons for the People*, by T. H. STOCKTON," (Pittsburgh: A. H. English & Co.. 1854; 12mo., pp. 420,) a volume amply sufficient to indicate the ground of Mr. Stockton's popularity as a preacher. It contains no artistically constructed sermons, judging by the ordinary standards of rhetoric; it affords no new views in theology; it shows no remarkable profoundness of thought. But it has qualities far higher than any of these, and far more necessary to success in preaching: it shows a strong faith, and a thorough religious experience in the preacher, who speaks from his heart out in every sermon; it displays a minute knowledge of the springs of human nature, and of the best and most appropriate means of touching them; it manifests a teeming fancy and a bold imagination—faculties not often found in combination; and while the substance of thought in the discourses is always ample for popular teaching, and the argument adapted for popular effect, both thought and argument are interfused in the fires of a noble passion that gives animation to the whole composition. As discourses *spoken*, or to be spoken, we have seen few superior to these; and it is in this view only that they should be judged. We should be glad to give some illustrative quotations marked in our reading of the volume, but our space will not allow it, and we must content ourselves with commending it to our readers of all classes, as containing a series of warm, stirring, and at the same time spiritual and eloquent "Sermons for the People."

(49.) WE have received the seventh volume of "*The Works of Shakspeare*, edited by the Rev. H. N. Hudson, A. M.," (Boston: James Munroe & Co., 1854; 12mo., pp. 522,) containing Richard III., Henry VIII., and Troilus and Cressida. We have before spoken of Mr. Hudson's careful and scholarly way of editing: and this volume shows the same skill as the preceding. Four more volumes will complete the work.

(50.) "*Pictorial Gatherings for the Young*" (New-York: Carlton & Phillips, square 12mo.) is the prettiest gift-book for children that has come under our notice this season. Its wood-cut illustrations are abundant, and are in the highest style of the art.

(51.) "*Plane and Solid Geometry, to which are added Trigonometry and Mensuration*, by GEORGE R. PERKINS, LL. D." (New-York: D. Appleton & Co., 1855; 8vo., pp. 445.) This book consists of three parts, of which the

first treats of the theoretical principles of geometry. Much use has been made here of Bourdon's Vincent, the selections from which are suitably modified for use in American schools. The second part treats of Plane and Spherical Trigonometry and Mensuration; the third contains all needful logarithmic and trigonometric tables. It is a compact treatise, admirably prepared for practical use, by a mathematician whose acknowledged eminence is of itself a sufficient guarantee that his work is well done.

(52.) "ORGANIC CHRISTIANITY" is the singular title of a book whose object is to show that the Christian Church has little more organization than a sand-heap. Its full title is "*Organic Christianity, or the Church of God, with its Offices and Government, and its Divisions and Variations, both in Ancient, Mediæval, and Modern Times, embracing a Thorough Exposition and Defence of Church Democracy*, by LEICESTER A. SAWYER." (Boston: J. P. Jewett & Co., 1854; 12mo., pp. 455.) The book is, in reality, as the latter part of the title indicates, a plea for Congregationalism. In this respect it is not of much worth; but it has decided value as a summary account of Church polity in various ages and countries, presented with as fair a degree of impartiality as could be expected from the peculiar stand-point of the author. Considered in this light, it deserves a place in every minister's library.

(53.) "*The Elements of Intellectual Philosophy*, by FRANCIS WAYLAND." (Boston: Phillips, Sampson & Co., 1854; 12mo., pp. 426.) In this volume President Wayland gives the substance of a course of lectures which he has been accustomed to deliver for several years past to his classes at Brown University. It is, in fact, a good view of the recognised facts of psychology,—presented in a clear and easy style, but with too much diffuseness for a text-book. This fault is due, doubtless, to the fact that the lectures were originally prepared for oral delivery.

(54.) "*The Land of the Forum and the Vatican*, by NEWMAN HALL, B. A.," (New-York: R. Carter & Brothers; 18mo., pp. 462,) is an account of three months spent in Italy, in 1854, by an intelligent Englishman. It is not intended as a polemical treatise; but as it contains a record of things seen in the Roman states, and of inferences from them, legitimately drawn, it could not fail to be strongly anti-papal in its tendencies. The work will, perhaps, be more useful from the fact that the writer carefully avoids bitter and uncourteous language.

(55.) "*The Principles of Animal and Vegetable Physiology*, by J. J. BUSHMAN, M. D.," (Philadelphia: Blanchard & Lea, 1854; 12mo., pp. 234,) is a clear and succinct treatise, for popular use, on the functions and phenomena of organic life. It is illustrated by over one hundred wood-cuts. Prefixed to the work

is an excellent survey of the field of human knowledge and of the connexion of the sciences, in which Dr. Bushman takes the only true and safe ground in scientific pursuits, namely, that from the phenomena of nature and of the human mind, the superintendence of an infinite and personal intelligence can be as completely exhibited as that of the existence of any of the so-called laws of nature. We commend the book to teachers as well as to general readers.

(56.) Of the following pamphlets we regret that we can give nothing but the names:—

The Stranger in the Synagogue, by Simon Luska. Rochester: E. Darrow & Brother, 1854.

Report of the Special Committee of the Board of Regents of the Smithsonian Institution, on the Distribution of the Income of the Smithsonian Fund. Washington, 1854.

Railroads, History and Commerce of Chicago. Chicago, Ill., 1854.

First Annual Report of the Young Men's Christian Association of San Francisco. San Francisco, 1854.

Increased Mental Activity of the Age; its Causes and Demands. By E. O. Haven, D. D. Ann Arbor, 1854.

Report of Hon. James Meacham, of Special Committee of Board of Regents of Smithsonian Institution, on Distribution of Income. Washington, D. C., 1854.

A Lecture on the Human Body. By John A. Parsons. New-York: C. Shepard & Co., 1854.

First Annual Report of the Washington City Young Men's Christian Association. Washington, 1854.

The Two Views of Episcopacy: Old and New. Philadelphia: Stavely & M'Calla, 12 Pear-street, 1854.

Edinburgh Temperance Tracts, No. 1. By Rev. H. Boner. New-York: R. Carter & Brothers, 285 Broadway.

Catalogue of Whitewater College, Ind., for the year ending June 28, 1854. Centreville, Ind.

A Review of the Controversy respecting the Proper Rendering of Elohim and Θεος into Chinese. London: Werthium & Macintosh, 24 Paternoster Row, 1854.

Thirteenth Annual Report of the Philadelphia Sabbath Association. Philadelphia, 1854.

Thirteenth Annual Report of the American Baptist Publication Society, 1854. Philadelphia.

Catalogue of Allegheny College, Meadville, Pa., 1853-4. Pittsburgh: W. S. Haven, 1854.

ART. VIII.—LETTERS ON RECENT FRENCH LITERATURE.

LETTER IV.

PARIS, 1854.

Essays on General Criticism is the title of a pompous project just inaugurated by a volume of over six hundred octavo pages. (*Essais de Critique Generale.* Premier essai: Analyse general de la connaissance. Bornes de la connaissance. Plus une appendice sur les principes generaux de la Langue et des Mathematiques. Par CH. RENOUVIER. Paris: Librairie philosophique de Ladrange. New-York: Hector Bossange et Fils.) This ample specimen of the performance is far from answering the lofty purpose. Yet as a purpose, of itself, may indicate a real advancement in the march of thought—which is, you know, the guiding principle of my selections for these running notices—I deem it useful to acquaint your readers with the author's object and even his position.

The precise nature of the object will be stated hereafter, in his own exposition. In general, it is no other than to constitute the universal science, or, to speak more familiarly, perhaps, Bacon's *philosophia prima.* I say to constitute, for the translation above presented of the title has made some sacrifice of complete accuracy to our idiom. It is, in strictness, not essays "on," but essays *of*, the subject treated that the author has intended and accordingly expressed—attempts not merely to criticise, but to create.

As to his philosophical position, the author frankly himself declares it to be, on the one hand, that of "continuator of Kant," while, on the other, he "accepts a fundamental formula of Positivism—the reduction of all our knowledge to the laws of phenomena." To lop from Kant the floating basis of his ontological metaphysics, and to add to Comte the theoretic complement of his as *mystical* empiricism—such, in fact, appears to be the writer's aspiration. And this undoubtedly is the true direction to a philosophy of the sciences.

It may, on this account, be worth remarking that this middle tendency is represented by a young and enterprising school of thinkers in this city. Most of its members had their ominous origin in what are styled the Humanitarians, of which the dreamy Pierre Leroux was the patriarch. But, they seem minds of too much vigour not to have emerged from that swampy source. In fact, they opened their distinct career with a collective publication entitled the *Encyclopedie Nouvelle:* for men who really have any stuff in them, must, of necessity, commence ambitiously, although their schemes are left in consequence unfinished, as occurred here too. Thus did Bacon, Pascal, Leibnitz, who each projected, in his teens, a reconstruction of the entire system of human knowledge. But, without meaning in the least degree to push the parallel suggested beyond the daring undertaking and final failure of the new cyclopedists, I have to note to you that the present writer is a leading member of the school. His previous writings have attracted notice beyond the precincts of the sect, which is rather difficult in this community of scientific exclusivism. The earliest was entitled "Manuals of the History of Philosophy;" then, the

article "Philosophy" in the said aborted encyclopedia. With these presumptions and preparations for more than ordinary competency, backed by, also, the combined tendency of the group of thinkers above alluded to, the undertaking of M. Renouvier is quite important as an attestation, and perhaps even as a designation, of the mental requisite of the age. But in the article of execution it will be easy to evince his failure.

Beginning properly with the foundation, he sets to filling up the Kantian chasm called the "absolute," or, "things in themselves." The easy refutation, which fills the opening fifteen sections, is not only quite effective, but, in many points, ingenious; as where he shows the famous sophism of Zeno, concerning motion, to turn merely on the conception of the latter as an *entity.* In order fully to appreciate the merit of the observation, the reader should remember the contortions of the acute Bayle (*Historical Dictionary*, Art. Zeno) in his vain endeavour to supply a sufficient solution. And, in our own day, Mr. Mill (see chapter "Fallacies" in his Logic) remains, despite the new philosophy of *relativity*, no less incompetent. The general conclusion of the author, from his disquisition, is, that nothing can by possibility be known of anything "in itself," that, to us, all knowledge and even reality consist alone of "representation." This relative notion, with its two abutments, the "representor" and "representee" (*representé*)—terms which he also substitutes for Kant's subjective and objective—such are the sole and solid basis of human knowledge.

There is little to object to this account save the neology; but innovation of the verbal sort is only justified by strict necessity. It militates against the fundamental requisite of perspicuity. Even the personal advantage of an apparent originality is more than negatived by the prejudgments of the discerning, who will not fail to suspect a writer, who begins with novelties of language, of being but scantily engrossed with novelty of ideas. And the suspicion will, in fact, be well founded in proportion as the subject treated lies less remote from the foundations of human knowledge. It is only on its surface and, so to say, its superficialities, that innovation of expression can be necessary. It is only at the summit that the tree acquires new branches; the trunk and limbs, although enlarged, remain identical perpetually. However paradoxical, profundity of thought is therefore normally correlative to popularity of language. Accordingly, in the present instance, we have the familiar word *relation*, which, together with its double substrate, conveys the meaning of the author. Nay, it denotes it not only more familiarly, but more fully and philosophically. While relation expresses solely and universally a *fact*, representation imports an *act*, implies an agent, suggests a cause—which is to shove our author back into the chasm of the "absolute." The *things* related will be also no less admirably designated by the epithets of subjective and objective; which, as derived from popular language, will, despite the author's repudiation, remain, perhaps, the latest relic of the Königsberg philosophy.

These two terms of all relation, or, if you will, representation, compose, according to the author, in the point of view of science, a complete division of all beings into a "double series of functions, progressively more general, of one another. Conscience, memory, and the other mental faculties with the organs of the senses, make up the human functions; but these resolve them-

selves into the larger (functional) orders of matter and thought." In professing to follow Kant, the author promised us to do much better than Kant, and more especially in clearness of expression. And this, indeed, is a prerogative of both his countrymen and his language. Yet I submit that the passage just cited has scarce a rival in Jacob Behmen for obscurity, confusion, incompleteness, and even for stark ignorance. The fact of the obscurity is but too sensible to the reader. The confusion is seen, for instance, in the conjunction, on the one hand, of the mental faculties and sensuous organs in the same category, and then in resolving, on the other hand, this single class into the wider functions, *indiscriminately*, of matter and of thought; for these two notions are intended by the author, on the contrary, as being respectively the summaries of the antagonistic series. The incompleteness is grossly visible in the omission of the least attempt to sketch the complemental functions of the material series; also in the imperfection of the rude synopsis of the human; furthermore, in the failure to give relation itself a place in this systematic enumeration of all the elements of knowledge. In fine, the ignorance, besides the specimens implied in all the foregoing crudenesses, attains a climax in the author's express notion of the serial order; for where he states the two series to be functions of one another, in an order more and more *general*, he should have said the very contrary; the order is from general to particular. The example he himself adduces shows this contradiction to his expression; for "consciousness, memory, and the other mental faculties" are each progressively more *particular* than the former. But, of progress in any form, the author knows, and indeed says, nothing; he has truly taken from Positivism nothing but its bare negation of metaphysics.

Let us try, however, briefly to extract his meaning from the foregoing jumble. All phenomena are resolvable into relation, with its two abutments. These abutments are themselves, in turn, analyzable into relations, but may provisionally be regarded as the "substances" they seem to be. They are resolvable, as even such, into the dual substances of mind and matter, of which respectively they are denominated *faculties* and *forms*. The former the perceiving element, the latter the impressing, they embrace inevitably the whole realm of the cognoscible. The serial order of their mutual action, that is to say, of their relations, (or what the author means above by their being "functions of each other,") affords the proof as well as principle of universal classification. In fine, the reason of their correspondence—which is no other than the fact that both the series are but one, instead of being in opposition—explains a problem to which the author next proceeds, with like uncouthness. In the premises, however, I conceive his meaning to have been, in substance, as thus elucidated, argued, and completed; and it at all events presents, I think, *in fundamental outline*, the definition, distribution, and demonstration of human knowledge.

The nature of this knowledge, as distinguished from consummate science, is the point which our philosopher with due propriety proceeds to next. *Representations* are all seized, he says, by knowledge in "confused synthesis," which are developed in the progress of experience by analysis. The passage then to science from knowledge is the result of analysis. To *know* (*connaitre*)

is to possess a rude notion of general laws; to *study* is to labour to unravel and arrange them; to know (*savoir*) *scientifically* is to reconstruct them, thus defined, phenomenon by phenomenon, and law by law, in their natural order. This is also like the preceding, correct in substance, although crude in form.

The observation that will first present itself is the comparative superiority of the French idiom, which here, as elsewhere, has distinct expressions that ours has not. To *know* as a savage and as a man of science are still the same in Anglo-Saxon. This is due in part, no doubt, to the fact that the French dialect came out of Roman civilization; and the famous "Saxon" out of the forests of Germany. But to return to the author. What he calls "confused syntheses" is a confusion of synthesis with induction. There can in truth be no synthesis but as a consequence of prior analysis, which is what renders it the method proper of strict science. The main defect is, however, the absence of the rationale of this procession, which we saw emerge spontaneously from a preceding rectification. The mental order being, in fact, a complicate continuation of the material, our knowledge necessarily commences at the *lower* end of the phenomenal scale. This is seized then by rude induction, on the basis of mere resemblances, not by synthesis, for the mind but *takes*, and does not *put*, the things together. Coming afterward to mark their differences, it is carried, by analysis, back to the simple and thus accessible extremity of the scale. And having thus obtained the clew, it turns back into the upward course, described correctly by the author as that of science and of synthesis.

But it were idle to expose his vagaries on the prime article of method, of which he has in truth no philosophic notion. Accordingly, he speaks of it but incidentally, and in a passage where the particular sciences are distinguished from the universal. I shall dismiss him with a compact abstract, presenting both these points at once, and which will also give an improved specimen of the contexture of his composition.

The scientific knowledge above defined presents degrees, as the operation of synthesis is limited and progressive; hence, a multiplicity of sciences, or rather fragments of science. These partial sciences do not sound the depths of general laws; they are founded on vulgar data of experience; they confine themselves, in their respective spheres, to explaining facts. To explain a fact is to refer it to other facts more general, to assign its place in an aggregate of related phenomena; the result is to evolve a law. The law may be resolved itself into a still higher law, an "enveloping function." In this way the sciences tend to gradually fill up their intervals, and may be hoped to merge at last into a universal science.

But while the particular sciences have drawn their data from vulgar knowledge, the general science requires a principle which is not given by it and cannot be. Hence it takes the humble title first of philosophy or study of science; later, of scepticism, which is also an inquiry; finally, of criticism, which is its present appellation. Here we see the author's explanation of his title. "The problem of the sole science was to construct a sole synthesis. The problem of general criticism is to trace the bounds of scientific knowledge in essaying to constitute this universal synthesis, after assembling all the disposable elements of that construction."—P. 89. But is such a synthesis possi-

ble, and is criticism the true means? The author answers both the questions by proceeding to the task.

The special sciences are established in the midst of laws and of phenomena, without examining the fundamental problems; they repose then upon mere *observation*. The data which this observation proceeds upon are of two sorts: one, more general, such as number, measure, space, time, composing the mathematical sciences; the other, more "enveloped," and thus less open to observation, such as the phenomena of heat, electricity, organization. The latter require the "methods of systematic experimentation, with the auxiliaries of hypothesis, analogy, induction." Beyond these, the human mind conceives no method for the special sciences. What shall be, then, the method of the universal science? The analysis of the "representation" itself, in distinction from the mere acceptance of the data represented, which were the object of observation, experiment, &c. The result of this transcendental analysis is a system of categories, and the method self-inspection, *psychology!* Here we see the author falling flatly into metaphysics, where I consequently leave him and his project. The very notion of *representation*, which he commenced with recognising as the final element of possible knowledge, he here proposes to "analyze!" And this, moreover, he calls psychology, which means analysis of the *mind*, that is to say, of one alone of the *terms* represented! But here he knows no more than others what it is he says or does. He was quite tolerably comprehensible and even substantially correct for eighty pages, while he moved on what he took from Positivism. His first attempt to step beyond this narrow strip of terra firma, in the endeavour to construct the theory (which Comte omits) upon the void, has but the result of precipitating him headforemost into Germanism, for which his subtle but not solid intellect presents indeed a quite un-French affinity.

His mental character, in fact, is manifested also in his style, which is disjointed, uncircumstantial, spasmodic, in a word, *unnatural*. I say unnatural, because in conflict with the continuity of the works of nature. Without the power to grasp this profound order, which inspires both amplitude and geniality, this sort of style essays to counterfeit a logical clearness by the grammatical. It chops its sentences into brief, blunt, and categorical enunciations, which are quite intelligible individually, but make a chaos if conceived together. No doubt the readers it is really destined for have small propension to coherent thinking, and hence the reason of the existence of the fashion; its harsh abruptness they take for earnestness, its vulgarity for vigour, its penetration for profundity, its peremptoriness for proof. It is the style, in short, of revolutionary—known as "popular"—literature; the style of newspapers, of novels, of pamphlets; a conjoint product of our current epoch of destruction, not construction, and of the advent of the multitude to be the arbiter of books. But to the thoughtful it is like fortifying an empty stomach with alcohol—a known illusion of the populace alike in literature and in life.

Besides the mental insufficiency, the author's position is inauspicious; for, being eclectic, it is essentially disorderly. But these things stand in the relation of cause and consequence to one another. There is no instance of an intellect of the first order being eclectic, or condescending to be the "continuator," any more

than the footman of another. This is the province, as it is the index, of the parasitic grade of minds which feel incapable of standing by themselves.

In fine, the worst is, that M. Renouvier has leaned upon a void. In consequence, he flounders aimlessly in the abyss of Germanism through the succeeding three hundred pages in definition of his categories. Their nomenclature alone will serve for comment upon his success. It runs: Number, Position, Succession, Quality, Becoming, (*devenir*,) Causality, (though he began by rejecting causation,) Finality, Personality; to which are added the "antithesis" and "synthesis" of each of these, the foregoing terms being the "thesis" of the trinal aspect. All this, which is already, it is seen, of Kantian formidableness, is further bristled with algebraic formulas—another symptom of incompetency. In fine, he closes with what it would appear more logical to have commenced with—the refutation, as he styles it, of the "only four philosophers who had preceded him in systematically putting forth a code of categories; namely, Aristotle, Descartes, Kant, and Hegel. His discussion of these famous thinkers has, I assure you, nothing new. It is only worth remarking that, though filling half the volume, it is presented in the form of an Appendix; another index of the writer's fitness to construct the universal science! You may conclude a man of long appendixes, or prefaces, or introductions, to be much less master of his subject than mastered by it.

> *Infelix operis summa, quia ponere totum*
> *Nesciet.*—HORACE.

In fine, the title of a *Criticism*, which Renouvier gives that science, proves how correctly his mental portraiture and position have been delineated. For writers of this class have one consistency at least, to wit, consistency or uniformity of *disorder*.

And yet the author of this lame performance (which a Boston *savant* might perhaps have fabricated) makes this naive declaration at page 381:—"I am confident of having done better than my predecessors, [aforesaid, that is, Aristotle, Descartes, Kant, and Hegel,] owing chiefly to having grouped all the categories under the common notion of *relation*, and thus excluded the delusive idol of substance. In this, I have been the *first* to give a positive character to the study of the human understanding." Some of your readers may be aware that, in the "*Vestiges of Civilization*," the general notion of relation had been laid down some years before as the foundation of the study, not alone of the human mind, but of every other knowledge whatsoever. It was there also made accordingly the firm basis of a theory which gives to Positivist pragmatism the proper character of a *philosophy*, and even constitutes the universal synthesis. Not that I tax the French philosopher with plagiarizing from this work, with which he doubtless is unacquainted, and has nothing in common but the great design; its execution in one small volume would, in fact, afford the best of comments on the promised series of his corpulent octavos. But the coincidence even in design was worth remarking as an attestation to the opportunity and perhaps truth of the common project—a project emanating on the one hand from the metropolis of civilization, and on the other from the woods of America.

Another writer of the same school, or, at least, certainly of the like character, has also given his lucubrations on a theme substantially the same. The title of this volume is, the "Theory of the Human Reason;" (*Theorie de la Raison Humaine.* Par Charles Bailly. Paris: Ladrange. New-York: Hector Bossange et Fils;) much the same, it is remarkable, as that adopted by an English namesake, to whom your Quarterly paid, some time ago, the special compliment of castigation. The British Bailey meant, however, by the "Theory of Reasoning," the practical procedure of the faculty; while the French author would sound especially its principles or foundation—a point of difference somewhat illustrative of their respective nationalities.

The latter writer begins his theory of the human reason, like Renouvier, with an express repudiation of the absolute. Human knowledge can, he says, pretend, in neither its principles, nor axioms, nor other starting-points, to anything of this perfection. The so-called axioms are but propositions respecting one of three heads: 1st. Objects, or the *congruities* of external phenomena; 2d. *Differences* among those objects; 3d. *Combinations* of the two preceding classes. Human knowledge in all three can only rest on the *relation* between the "Ego" and those objects of the outer world. The writer, thus far, is in concert with his fellow theorist above expounded, and both in consequence are *so*, presumably, and, I think, positively, with the truth. But M. Bailly is, in all besides, more vagrant still than his competitor.

It was sufficiently pretentious in him to commence with the profession of recasting the understanding, in the daring fashion of a new Descartes. But the procedure of M. Bailly, in his style of writing, is still more impudent. His composition is as categorical as if it were a revelation. His sentences are all delivered oracularly, and make a "concourse" not a whit less chaotic than did the atoms of Epicurus. I explained above the system, or, at least, the source, of this spasmodic writing in rebuking it in the more mitigated exhibition by Renouvier. It has its origin in the endeavour of the writers to be clear, and in their confusion of merely grammatical with dialectical perspicuity; and it finds its encouragement in the acceptance of the generality of readers. I may here add that the expedient, systematic or sincere, reveals, in turn, the collective character of the philosophers in question.

The method of these various aspirants of the "Young France" of speculation consists in studying Germanism instead of nature. All truth is to be found, they doubt not, in Kant, Fichte, Schelling, and Hegel; the only thing is to extract it from these labyrinthine writers. Now, for this process, the French language is just the instrument required; a language in which all good Frenchmen believe that nothing can be writ or rendered which, *ipso facto*, is not only clear, but must be also sense and truth. Upon this basis, then, our *exploiteurs* proceed to paraphrase the German oracles; taking care, however, to commence with a repudiation of their mysticism. This precautionary preface, which seems often but an artifice designed to propitiate the "old fogies" of French science, is sometimes also, no doubt, a product of the national spirit of positivism. But it is in either case the mere frontispiece; the body of the edifice remains Teutonically dubious and disorderly. Indeed, the darkness and disorder are augmented by the French copyist. The winding

sentences of the original give the appearance of connexion, their and misty amplitude bears the consistency of substance to German visions. Whereas, when chopped up into French apothegms, both sense and logic are a rope of sand. For the French language has the precious property of all pellucid bodies, and lets a charlatan be seen behind it as well as a genius.

This explanation suits exactly, you perceive, the style and matter, as above described, of those two samples of the new school; and it would equally characterize a kindred sophist in another line, with whose more mischievous temerities you are acquainted: I mean Proudhon. M. Bailly, like Renouvier, makes a plausible commencement, and proceeds a little way upon a nearly scientific basis. He has even a quite novel notion of the nature of science in general, which, though ridiculous as he enunciates it, shows a dim perception of a profound truth. One of his axioms is, that "every science is a cone;" in other words, a triangle revolved upon its perpendicular. He should have added, to become intelligible, that, in all its systematic measurements, the mind proceeds as when it measures land—by *triangulation;* and that, while in the latter instance it has to investigate but *one* dimension, in the world of science it must explore all three—which rounds the cone. But the advanced notions of M. Bailly being not the consequence of comprehension, being scarcely other than a mere instinct of the situation of the age, they are always jumbled with the most preposterous of metaphysical anilities. Here, for instance, is his series of the *sciences:* "Arithmetic, Algebra, Geometry, Statics, Mechanics, Astronomy, *Music*, the *Arts*, *Poetry*, *Morals*, *Theology*," &c.! You see the upper part is fair enough; but from the middle downward a monstrosity.

M. Jules Simon, a professor of distinction, and even a philosopher, at least of the eclectic order, has lately published a work on Duty, (*Le Devoir.* Par Jules Simon. Paris: Hachette et Cie. New-York: Hector Bossange et Fils,) which has just attained a second edition, and has besides received the *imprimatur* of a crown and prize from the Academy. Yet in the face of both this popular and Academic commendation, I must think his treatise does not put Panætius, as transcribed by Cicero, in the shade. There is nothing, in the first place, of the elegant arrangement or deductive ratiocination of the heathen; a defect which I must try to remedy, if I would hope to give you, briefly, the means of judging if there be Christian superiority in even the principle.

These principles are liberty, the love of God, and of mankind—the latter two being final, the first alone the efficient, cause. Liberty, political and civil, rests on moral freedom. It ought to be defined, not the power of doing or of not doing, but rather the power of *willing* or of not willing. The right of citizenship must depend, then, on this moral personality, itself a result of the freedom of the will. The freedom of the will is thus the general foundation, and is susceptible, the author says, of "demonstration." To this effect, he then rehashes all the commonplaces of this threadbare theme, of which the following may be cited as a specimen: "If any one think that my will is not free, let him lay me a wager of one thousand crowns that I will not within an hour's space lift up three times my hand." Is not this a naive species of demonstra-

tion? Such as it is, however, it goes, evidently, right against the argument. The wish to win one thousand crowns could be no light weight in the volential balance. It would not be, indeed, equivalent to physical necessity. But the difference is only matter of mere *degree*. And most of the sophistry upon the subject is owing precisely to inadvertence to this graduation of refinement in the motive—from the coarse compulsion of material force up to the light caprices of moral influence. The apparent diminution and disappearance of the constraint take place, in fact, not in the line of efficacy, but of evidence.

Another sample of the "demonstration" is, that will or mind *believes* its freedom. But this being not contested, the question was, if there be no illusion? None whatever, says the author, *for* the creed is "common to all mankind, with the exception of a few sceptical philosophers." Now all mankind, until some three centuries since, and full seven-eighths of them down to this day, believe the sun to move around the earth, instead of *vice versa*. Was this belief, though unopposed for countless ages by a single "sceptic," and respecting, too, a simple and external fact, the less illusory? Nor could it mend the argument to add, that the belief in free volition is held by savages and children. This were to say that ignorance is the best guarantee for knowledge; instead of being, according to intensity, the sport of necessary error. Such are the consequences of Cousin and ontological eclectism, in its default of gradation or progression.

But if the author does not, we see, "demonstrate" the freedom of the will, he, on the other hand, goes far to demonstrate the contrary. "A human action," says he, (p. 11,) "comprises four elements. In order to act it is necessary to will, and in order to will it is necessary to know both what to will and why." Now here are even *two* necessities—the knowledge and the motive—to which volition is, it seems, subjected, under pain of permanent inaction, or, more properly, of not existing in any form; for the famous free-will of indifference is a negation of volition—the very essence of the will consisting solely in activity. M. Simon is full of instances of this unconscious self-refutation. Nor, with his odds and ends of doctrine, and his husk and shell of language, would strict consistency have been well possible to a Spinoza or a Chillingworth.

M. Simon has, however, a lucid interval of robust reasoning, though the conclusion be, I fear, as usual, in opposition to his purpose. I cite the passage *in extenso* both on account of its own suggestiveness and as an act of far-fetched equity toward the writer. He is removing from his "demonstration" of the freedom of the will the grand objection of the foreknowledge of the Divinity.

The force of this objection proceeds, says he, from our assumption to know the attributes of the Divinity, and place among them his being *in time*. For if the Deity were really subject to the condition of duration—

"Divine foreknowledge would become insoluble, and human liberty impossible. On the one hand, a Divinity who should exist in time would be imperfect and contradictory, and by consequence impossible; on the other, he would serve to give the reason of nothing, and the world, like its God, would be a riddle. That a God in time is quite impossible will be evinced by the reflections:—

"That the notion of time implies divisibility, and the notion of infinity indi-

visibility; whence it follows that an infinite or eternal time, if it existed, would, at the same time, be both finite and infinite, which is absurd.

"That the Deity, if he *endured*, could never have the plenitude of being, since he would always lack the part of it which was to follow in the course of time.

"That his thoughts and acts would succeed each other, and would consequently modify him; that thus the God of yesterday would not be strictly the God of to-day; whereas it is a contradiction that there could be two perfects, or that the same perfect could be perfect in different ways.

"That the notion of a beginning and termination of the world would assign to the existence of the Deity three distinct phases; that God would be at first a solitary, then a Creator, and that he would finally relapse into inaction and solitude.

"That the infinite would be divisible into integral parts; that the commencement and end of the world would mark an hour in eternity, a change in the resolutions of God, a revolution in his thoughts, a modification of his being; that God would have a history, and similar to man himself, devoured incessantly by past and future, would pass away and be no more.

"That God, by entering the sphere of time, is made to enter the world itself; that there no longer is any reason for not confounding him with the world, and conceiving him as subject to its laws; and then who will be author of those laws? Will it be said that they are necessary? Well, if they are, wherefore a God? What would become of the creation if the Deity were to resemble us?

"It is humiliating without doubt to avow that God is incomprehensible; but, also, it must be owned that with a God who was not incomprehensible, the world and all its contents would be so. Incomprehensibility is the definition of the infinite. The infinite intelligence of infinite intelligence is infinite intelligence. (*L'intelligence infinie de l'intelligence infinie est l'intelligence infinie.*) All the means of comprehensibility—time, space, motion, number—commence on this side of the Divinity, and with his works, of which they make a part.

"Nor is it only the divine prescience that is objected to human liberty, but, also, the omnipotence of God. Who speaks of omnipotence must speak not only of a force which nothing *can* prevail against, but, too, a force against which nothing *does* prevail. Whence, if the Deity be omnipotent, it is not sufficient to say, that nothing comes to pass against his will; we must admit that all things happen in conformity with his will, or rather through the agency of his will. And in this case, I pray you, show me, in the whole universe, a place for liberty! or give a tolerable explanation of moral evil!

"The sole answer to this, as to the other objection, is the incomprehensibility of God and his creation. The existence of man is as incompatible with that of God as the liberty of man is with the omnipotence of God. If God be indeed all-powerful, it seems impossible to comprehend a free agency exterior to his being; but, if this being be omnipresent, it seems equally impossible to comprehend how the existence of a single being can have place external to it. We must therefore either deny the world—which is impossible, or the perfection of God—which is impossible, or maintain the coexistence of contradictories—which is impossible, or acknowledge that the Deity is utterly incomprehensible; and this admitted, we may say with Bossuet, that all impossibilities disappear."—Pp. 52–55.

No doubt this manner of philosophy was quite convenient to the popish prelate, though his flat profession of it was a platitude in such a thinker. What is it, then, in M. Simon, to produce a file of those *impossibilities*, resulting all from the assumption of free-will, and then to think to save this freedom from the overwhelming alternative, by the mere arbitrary supposition of *incomprehensibility!* The worst that I can say is, that it is the genius of metaphysics, of a philosophy which founds its principles on mere negation; whereas, in Bossuet, the same expedient was at least affirmative, although imaginary.

And if our author would only keep to his asylum of the incomprehensible!

But no; he makes another somerset, pretends to pierce the veil himself, and pursue the Deity behind the curtain of time. "If the distinction," says he, "of past, present, and future disappear, and give place to a coördination of cause and effect in the divine knowledge, then will prescience be no longer an obstacle to liberty, for prescience will no longer be prescience—it will be omnipresence."—P. 52. Here, you see, is a definition of the darkest property of the same Divinity in whose "incomprehensibility" the author just had taken refuge! But, again, the omnipresence is declared in the preceding extract to be, *on the contrary*, annihilative of free-will and even man's existence! And, after all, the substitution of the omnipresence, or the omniscience, (which was possibly the author's meaning,) for the "prescience" of the Divinity, would be, in fact, a puerile juggle upon words; for though the divine presence or the divine knowledge were a universal *now and here*, the human will could none the easier escape the infinite control!

You must have now, I think, sufficiently the mental measure of M. Simon, in the matter both of *metaphysics* and of *logic*. Before passing to his *moral* principles, let me interpolate an explanation. In thus exhibiting his grotesque failure to prove the freedom of the human will, I must not therefore be supposed to conclude for necessity. My business is not here conclusion, but exposition. The object of these Letters is to keep your readers in possession of the current progress of European intellects, by select samples from its various sections. Thus, in the present, the pretentious enterprise of M. Renouvier will represent the state of general philosophy, and the academic essay of M. Simon the state of ethics. I wished, besides, in the analysis of M. Simon's incoherences, to show, moreover, the impossibility, to metaphysicians in general, of simply linking three propositions without collapsing into contradiction.

Conceding to M. Simon his thus "demonstrated" free-will, the various motives which are to actuate it are first passions, then ideas. The part of passion is to impel, as of will to assent, and of intelligence to conceive. Ideas cannot determine action in opposition to passion; they do so only through the passions which they stimulate antagonistically. Being, however, thus the causes, although indirectly, of the result, they may be taken as the basis of morality, and are much preferable to the passions, which are more unstable and indefinable.

All the passions are referable to pleasure and to pain; which are intensified sensations, agreeable or disagreeable. The sources of all ideas are reason, conscience, and perception. The several objects of the latter are: God, self, and the eternal world; their coalition with the passions produces religion, selfishness, science. For you must remark that M. Simon is a rationalistic deist, to whom it is "the same to see into God and to see into the truths of reason."—P. 193. Despite this primary position which he gives to religion or the "love of God," he allows, however, that the love of self is at the root of the most generous actions. But he argues, in extenuation, as follows: "If I reflect, in doing my duty, that God will recompense me, have I, on that account, done any less my duty?" Yes, you have, according to your own standard, which derives morality from motive. You have not, according to the test of science, which places morals in the act itself, that is to say, in its conformity to the economy of nature.

As the intellect can rule the passions but through opposite passions, it might be easily supposed that the latter are the true principles of duty. Accordingly, in fact, most moralists, both heathen and Christian, and many who were neither, such as Hobbes, Fourier, and Adam Smith, have based their systems upon selfishness, the sentiments, the passions; to the exclusion of the intelligence, of ideas. The author objects, that they give no origin for these their moral criteria; an omission which he would supply by the sole alternatives of God (reason) or force; he does not see that he reverses the historic order of these extreme tests, and overlooks a third criterion of transition intervening—the very principle which would explain to him all the moral systems which he flouts so shallowly.

Not sentiments or adverse passions, then, rule the passions, but *ideas*. The sole idea that does so is justice. "All men perceive justice because all possess reason, and because it is an abstract form of the love of God." The author grounds it thus on sentiment, after defining it to be an idea, and only proves it, in the usual fashion, by a pretended universality. He tries to palliate this crude confusion by saying that science itself begins with faith: *Toute science commence par une act de foi.* He deludes himself by the word *faith*, which is applied to different things. There is a faith of imagination, a faith of induction, a faith of demonstration, the latter only being the faith of science. Moreover, science does not commence with acts of faith of either kind, which is essentially an act of more or less imperfect *inference;* the starting-ground of science is acts of feeling or *perception.*

Then follows a chapter of common-places on the "nature of justice," of which I copy you a single passage, by way of sample of its fresher bathos; also as an illustration of the mongrel pantheism whereinto the Cousin metaphysics is at present vanishing in France:—"Reason is the sense of the absolute. There is no other reality besides God and the world, and in the world there are but individuals. But the ideas of reason are God diversely perceived, according to the relations we ascribe to him with the world," &c.—P. 267. Could this have been transcended in perspicuity or philosophy by your American or Emersonian illuminati? And yet this stuff has, I regret, received the double approbation of the literary public and the Academy. Not, however, it is right to note, of the Academy of *Sciences*, but of the *Academie Française*, of which the province is confined to style: and the style of Simon, although pedantic, seems indeed as passable as well could be, with such a medley incoherence in the thought.

Not to dismiss him with unmingled blame, I quote, in fine, another passage, the only one perhaps in the whole volume to be approved without restriction. It speaks of the majority as a criterion of right or truth. "A people that has come to make public opinion a moral law is necessarily sceptical in morals. It no longer has belief in anything when it affects to believe in majorities. *It submits itself to this coarse tutelage but through the want of any principle.* It is a cowardly abdication, for it is the abdication of reason to force."—P. 305. No, not cowardly; for it is a result of necessity.

Art. IX.—RELIGIOUS AND LITERARY INTELLIGENCE.

Theological and Religious.

Professor W. Esser, at the Catholic Academy of Munster, has recently put forth a manual, entitled "*Psychologie*, 1. Theil. *Erkenntnissvermögen*." (Munster, 1854, pp. 363.) The author is an able pupil of the late Professor Hermes; and although the system which nursed his youth has been condemned by the Roman see, he yet remains, like almost all the other Hermesians, a faithful adherent of his Church, to certain doctrines of which he endeavours to make his philosophic argumentations subservient. The Hermesian school, not many years ago predominating in the Catholic Church of Northern and Middle Germany, is now fast disappearing; but works like the one mentioned will secure to it a lasting place in the history of Catholic as well as philosophic literature. It has been justly praised for two peculiarities—for plainness and clearness of language on the one hand, and for liberal Catholic views on the other. The work of Professor Esser is a well-arranged, clear, and complete text-book, covering the whole range of psychological science. As theologians, the Hermesians at one time paid a particular attention to practical and moral questions, showed a decided opposition to many of the grossest absurdities of modern Catholicism, (as particularly to the immaculate conception,) and were eagerly striving to keep on the height of science. It is a lamentable fact, that such a school should be doomed to swell the number of so many others, which, in spite of the superior talents and virtues of their members, have faded away under the withering hand of Papal power.

Germany has long had a fair number of excellent scientific periodicals, reviewing and thus giving a history of contemporaneous literature. All of them belong to Protestant Germany; the Catholic Church, although the majority of the German people is under its dominion, had until lately none. Several attempts have been made to meet this universally felt want, but all have been unsuccessful. At the instigation of the "Pius Associations" established in 1848, it will now be tried again, whether Catholic Germany is possessed of sufficient interest in general literature to support one single Catholic literary gazette. It is a significant circumstance that the new paper (*Katholische Literatur-Zeitung*, *herausgegeben von Dr. Brischar*, Vienna) is published in Austria, which hitherto has always stood aloof from literary movements in Catholic Germany, but now discloses more and more its intention to make itself considered the protector and patron of German Catholicism. The editor of the new paper, Dr. Brischar, is a pupil of the school of Tübingen, and was some years ago engaged in continuing the Church history of Count Hollberg, of which he has published two or three volumes. It promises to review, from a Catholic standpoint, the literature of Germany and the prominent works of other countries. Germany is indisputably the scientific stronghold of Romanism; some of the contributors of the new paper are names well known beyond their Church and their native country. The first number appeared in August, 1854.

Brown's "History of Missions" has long been a standard work. A third edition of it has recently appeared, (*History of the Propagation of Christianity among the Heathen.* Edinburgh; 3 vols., 8vo.,) in which the modern missions are said to be fully treated.

Among the points made by the Tübingen writers against the early date of John's Gospel, was the assumption that no allusion to it could be found in the Clementine Homilies. Professor Dressel has set the matter at rest by the publication of a complete copy of the Homilies found by him among the Ottobonian manuscripts in the Vatican library: *Clementis Romani, quæ feruntur, homiliæ viginti nunc primum integræ. Textum ad Codicem Ottobonianum constituit* R. M. Dressel. Götting: 1853. In the 19th homily will be found the following citation from the ninth chapter of John: "To those who asked about the man blind from his birth and restored to sight, whether this man sinned or his parents that he was born blind, our Teacher replied, Neither did this man do some sin, nor his parents; but that by him might be manifested the power of God healing the sins of ignorance." Thus one by one all the positions of the opponents of John's Gospel, that have even a plausible show of foundation, are taken away.

The second edition of the first volume of Mr. Alford's "*Greek Testament*" (London: 8vo., pp. 936) has appeared. It differs from the first edition, in being conformed to Mr. Alford's second volume, as regards the revision of the text and the digest of various readings. This latter has been entirely rewritten, and the text, being now revised on the critical principles announced in the prolegomena to the second volume, differs considerably from that in the first edition.

The twenty-first volume of the *Corpus Reformatorum*, now in course of publication in Brunswick, contains "*Philippi Melancthonis Loci Theologici.*" (Brunsv. Schwetschke: 1854, 4to., pp. 550.) This convenient and cheap edition of a work so highly valued as Melancthon's Loci will be very acceptable to theological students.

The Church of England is agitated by proposals of change and innovation on many sides. Should the general cry for Convocation be successful, we may look with certainty, in the course of a few years, for radical modifications, and sooner or later, for disruption. Archdeacon Wilberforce, who has recently resigned his clerical functions, and gone over to Rome, has issued an "explanation," in which he inquires how far the popular principle of subscription to the English formularies is compatible with the rule of Church authority. The system he believes to be altogether bad, while it has not even the merit of being able to settle the differences which exist among individual Churchmen. He says:—

"The difficulty becomes greater when it is considered that the clergy are divided into various parties, who are widely opposed to one another in almost every particular. It may be allowable, perhaps, to employ the phraseology of a recent reviewer, who has distributed them into three classes, which he designates as High, Low, and Broad. The last may be expected to be comparatively inattentive to matters of doctrine, regarding the Church chiefly as a social institution, designed merely to raise the standard of morals and ameliorate the manners of men. But the High and Low agree in one point, if in nothing else, that to contend for the truth is the first duty of Christians. They differ, however, respecting almost every point of doctrine. One believes the Church to be the body of Christ, inhabited by his Spirit; the other supposes it to be little more than a religious club. One believes in baptismal regeneration and in the real presence; the other speaks of the sacraments as if they were only acted sermons. One affirms Christ to speak by the voice of his priests, and that deadly sin requires absolution; the other affirms that the priest's words are no more effective than those of his parish clerk. Yet both parties, as well as the Broad, who lie between them, subscribe to the same formularies, which they interpret avowedly in contradictory senses, and from which they deduce the most opposite results. If all this does not arise from the laxity of those who subscribe, but from the ingenuity of those who devised our formularies, they must certainly have been the greatest masters of equivocal expression whom the world has known." Subscription to the English formularies, he says, was originally imposed, and is still rendered by High Churchmen, on the principle that the Church's judgment should guide her members; but the Gorham case showed that the Church of England has transferred the decision respecting doctrines to the civil power, and that the most opposite statements respecting matters of faith are taught under her sanction.

Another striking symptom is the formation of the "Liturgical Revision Society," from whose "Declaration of Principles and Objects" we extract the following:—

III. The preface to the Book of Common Prayer asserts, that "it hath been the wisdom of the Church of England, ever since the first compiling of her public liturgy, to keep the mean between the two extremes, of too much stiffness in refusing, and of too much easiness in admitting, any variation from it." On the maxim thus presented for their guidance, the members of this society desire to act, and are moved by such "weighty and important considerations" as arise from "the exigencies" of *these present times*, to seek further "changes and alterations therein;" some of which, as the most necessary, they now proceed to specify:—

1. The Rubric: the word priest to be changed.
2. The Ordination Service: words abused to the purposes of sacerdotal assumption to be altered.
3. The Visitation of the Sick: the absolution to be omitted or qualified.
4. The Baptismal Offices: words asserting the spiritual regeneration of each recipient to be altered.
5. The Catechism to be revised.

6. The Burial Service: general language to be employed in expressing hope for the departed.

7. The Athanasian Creed: the damnatory clauses to be omitted.

8. The Apocryphal Lessons to be replaced by Scripture.

IV. A careful examination of the changes here specified will illustrate the chief aim of this society, which is to bring the Book of Common Prayer into closer conformity with the written word of God and the principles of the Reformation, by excluding all those expressions which have been assumed to countenance Romanizing doctrine or practice. It is believed this object will be greatly advanced by the combination of numbers, and the abandonment of desultory for systematic action. All, therefore, who are friendly to the cause of Protestantism in our Church—all who would gladly see the *letter* of our formularies, which have been altered for the worse more than once since the Reformation, brought again into harmony with the *spirit* of that glorious epoch—are invited to coöperate in this work, and to aid the society with their contributions, their influence, and, above all, their prayers.

V. As the Book of Common Prayer in its present form is "part and parcel" of the law of the land, and change in a single rubric affects the Act of Uniformity, not the slightest alteration can *legally* be made in it, (though more than one *illegal* change is to be found in its pages,) without the concurrence of both houses of parliament, and the sanction of the crown. With a view, therefore, to obtain such a revision of our liturgy as shall meet the wants of the age, the members of this society propose to collect, digest, and circulate. as widely as their means will allow, information connected with the subject of liturgical reform; in the hope of awakening the public mind to a more adequate sense of dangers, present and imminent, which encompass the Protestant Church of our fathers; and of comprehending within that Church many earnest Christians, who are now conscientiously deterred from her communion. They will attempt this by means of tracts and occasional papers; by deputing trustworthy representatives of their principles to address public or other meetings, wherever these shall be called for; by preparing petitions to parliament for general signature; and by such other constitutional methods as occasion shall furnish or suggest.

VI. With the divine blessing upon these endeavours, and on the discussions and inquiries which they may be expected to produce, it is hoped that parliament may, at no very distant period, be induced to address the crown for the appointment of a royal commission, in which laity may be combined with clergy; so that what is for the good of all classes may be settled by the wisdom of all, and a proper basis laid for sound liturgical reform. Without such reform the members of this society are convinced that no ecclesiastical changes, however well intended, can possibly reach to the root of existing evils, whether of *priestcraft* or *formalism*, or can render the Church of England what her martyred reformers undoubtedly intended her to be—a faithful witness to the truth of God as it is in Christ Jesus, and a diligent keeper of his holy word in its integrity and undivided authority.

Among the new works recently announced on the continent of Europe are the following:—

Cornelii a Lapide in Scripturam Sacram Commentarii, editio nova, Tirini in Job Commentario nec non Bellarmini in Psalmos explanatione aucta. (Paris: 10 vols., 8vo.)

Der Brief Judae des Apostels und Bruders des Herrn. Historisch, kritisch, exegetisch betrachtet von M. F. Rampf., d. Theol. Doct. u. Repetitor im erzbischöfl. Clericalseminar zu Freysing. Sulzbach, 1854: pp. 432, 8vo.

Disquisitio Critica et Historica de Clementis Romani priore ad Corinthios epistola, quam etc. publico ac solemni examini submittit Ecco Ecker. Trajecti ad Rhenum, 1854: pp. 137, 8vo.

Der Gottmensch. Die Grundidee der Offenbarung in ihrer Einheit und geschichtlichen Entwickelung dargestellt von Lic. Dr. C. W. Ed. Nägelsbach. 1. Band. Der Mensch der Natur. Nürnberg, 1854: pp. 449, 8vo.

Handwörterbuch f. den historischen u. doctrinellen Religionsunterricht. Nach den neuesten und besten Quellen bearb. u. unter Mitwirkung Mehrerer herausgeg. von *H. Kaiser* u. *L. Schmerbach.* Mit ein. Vorworte von Dr. W. Thilo. 2. verb. u. verm. Aufl. Leipzig, 1854: pp. 816, 8vo.

Charakterbilder aus der heil. Schrift im Zusammenhauge einer Geschichte des Gottesreiches dargestellt und für Lehrer und Leser des Bibelworts verfasst von A. Grube. 2. Thl.: Das Neue Testament. 1. Abth.: Das Leben Jesu. Leipzig, 1854: pp. 400, 8vo.

Biblia Veteris Testamenti Æthiopica, in V tomos distributa, ad libr. mss. fidem ed. et apparatu critico instruxit Prof. Dr. A. Dillmann. Tom. I, s. Octateuchus æthiopicus. Fasc. 2, qui cont. Numeros et Deuteronomium cum apparatu critico. Lipsiæ: pp. 198, 4to.

Riehm, E. Die Gesetzgebung Mosis im Lande Moab. Ein Beitrag zur Einleitung ins alte Testament. Gotha: pp. 136, 8vo.

Rinck, W. F., Die Religion der Hellenen aus den Mythen, den Lehren der Philosophen und dem Kultus entwickelt. II. Bd., 1. Abth.: Der Gottesdienst und die öffentlichen Feste der Hellenen. Zürich: pp. 328, 8vo.

Geschichte der letzten Propheten. Ein Beitrag zur Geschichte der bibl. Offenbarung von Lyc. Prof. Peter Schegg. 2. (letzte) Abth. Regensburg: pp. 214, 8vo.

Religion (de la) du nord de la France avant le Christianisme; par *Louis de Baecker*. Lille: 8vo.

Histoire de l'Eglise de France, composée sur des documents originaux et authentiques, par l'abbé *Guettée*. Vol. I. a IX. 9 vol. Paris: 8vo.

Histoire de la philosophie dans ses rapports avec la religion depuis l'ère chrétienne, par M. *Matter*, conseiller honoraire et ancien inspecteur général de l'instruction publique. Paris: 1 vol., 12mo.

We continue our summaries of the contents of the principal theological journals:—

Church of England Quarterly Review, (London,) for October:—I. Freedom of Inquiry: II. The Last Historical Problem: III. Phases of Modern Unbelief: IV. Ecclesiastical Courts: V. Wonders of the Deep: VI. The Second Coming of Christ: VII. Quarterly Report of Facts and Progress: VIII. Literature of the Quarter classified and reviewed.

Journal of Sacred Literature, (London,) for October:—I. Milman's History of Latin Christianity: II. The Historical Origin of the Passover: III. The Songs of Degrees: IV. The Resurrection of Jesus: V. The Attestation of Miracles: VI. Sceptical German Theology: VII. Was the Lord's Supper a Paschal Feast? VIII. Inspiration and Infallibility, &c.

Christian Remembrancer, (London,) for October:—I. Milman's Latin Christianity: II. Convocation Literature: III. Life of Mrs. Sherwood: IV. Liguori's Theory of Theft: V. Bunsen's Philosophy of Language: VI. Census of Education.

Eclectic Review, (London,) for *October*:—I. De Quincey: II. Schaff's Church History: III. Van de Velde's Journey through Syria and Palestine: IV. Balder—by the Author of "The Roman": V. Whewell's History of Moral Philosophy: VI. Mahon's History of England: VII. Dove's Elements of Political Science: VIII. National Education—State of the Question. *November*:—I. The Greek Church: II. The Tartar Conquerors: III. Hungarian Sketches in Peace and War: IV. The Pentateuch and its Assailants: V. Vinet's French Literature of the Eighteenth Century: VI. Autobiography of the Rev. W. Jay: VII. Murchison's Siluria: VIII. The Decimal System in Money, Weights and Measures.

London (Methodist) Quarterly Review, for October:—I. Theodore Parker and the Modern Deists: II. Life in Abyssinia: III. American School of Ethnology: IV. Jerome Cardan: V. Methodist Episcopal Church of America: VI. New Educational Measure for India: VII. Recent Roman History—Farini: VIII. The Danes and Northmen in Britain: IX. The Crystal Palace.

Quarterly Review of Methodist Episcopal Church, South, (Richmond,) for October:—I. The Theological Works of Thomas Paine: II. Physical Geography—Mrs. Somerville reviewed: III. The Life and Writings of Arminius: IV. "Judaism Unveiled:" V. Wesleyan Methodism in the Nineteenth Century.

The Free-Will Baptist Quarterly, (Providence, R. I.,) for October:—I. Christianity—Our Help and Hope: II. The Minister in the Pulpit: III. No better than we should be: IV. Support of the Ministry in the Freewill Baptist Denomination: V. Latter Day Revelations: VI. The Church: VII. Contemporary Literature: VIII. Periodical Literature.

Evangelical Review, (Gettysburg, Pa.,) for October:—I. Justin Martyr: II. The Genealogies of Jesus, in the Evangelists Matthew and Luke.: III. Notes on Prophecy: IV. Faith and Utilitarianism: V. Infidelity—Its Metamorphoses and Present Aspects: VI. Reminiscences of Lutheran Clergymen: VII. Manual of Sacred History.

Southern Presbyterian Review, (Columbia, S. C.,) for October:—I. The Doctrine of the Trinity, Practical and Fundamental: II. The Living Baptized for the Dead: III. The Phases of Society: IV. The Lunar

World: V. The Authority of Ecclesiastical Rulers: VI. Eloquence: VII. Duties of Masters: VIII. Life of Archibald Alexander, D. D.

Mercersburg Quarterly Review, (Chambersburg, Pa.) for October:—I. Questions concerning the Church: II. The Person of Christ: III. Modern Athens and the Monuments on the Acropolis: IV. Liturgical Contributions: V. Christian Cultus—Its Nature, History, and Relations: VI. America.

Universalist Quarterly Review, (Boston,) for October:—I. New-York and the Crystal Palace: II. Revelation Progressive: III. Ministerial Culture and Theological Schools: IV. Records of Bubbleton Parish: V. Prayer and Providence: VI. Remarks on the Blind and their Education: VII. Personal Identity with reference to the Future Life.

Christian Review, (New-York,) for October:—I. The Value of Church History: II. Christian Courtesy: III. The English Language: IV. The Religion of Turkey: V. City Missions: VI. Religious Progress of the Mississippi Valley: VII. The Covenants.

Bibliotheca Sacra and American Biblical Repository, (Andover,) for October:—I. Notes of a Tour from Damascus to Baalbec and Kuns: II. Our Saviour's Discourse in the Synagogue at Capernaum: III. Anselm's Doctrine of the Incarnation and Atonement: IV. Special Divine Interpositions in Nature: V. Paganized Ecclesiasticism, the Chief Antagonist of the Modern Missionary: VI. Notes upon the Geography of Macedonia.

The Biblical Repertory and Princeton Review, for October:—I. India—Its Past and Future: II. Origin of Writing: III. St. Ignatius and the Jesuits: IV. The True Barrier against Ritualism and Rationalism: V. Thoughts for the Ministry.

Among the new books in theology and kindred sciences recently announced in Great Britain are the following:—

Chronology of Creation; or, Scripture and Geology Reconciled. By Captain Thomas Hutton. 8vo.:—Vestiges of Divine Vengeance; or, The Dead Sea and the Cities of the Plain. By William Elfe Tayler. Small 8vo.:—History of the Council of Trent. With the Author's last Corrections and Additions communicated to the Translator. By L. F. Bungener. Crown 8vo.:—History of the Church of England, from the Reformation to the Present Time. By the Rev. W. Litton, M. A., Author of "The History of the Church of Christ." 8vo.:—The Various Denominations of the Christian World, from the Earliest Ages of the Church. By the Rev. J. B. Marsden, A. M., Rector of St. Peter's, Birmingham. 8vo.:—Christianity Viewed in Some of its Leading Aspects. By the Rev. A. L. R. Foote, Author of "Incidents in the Life of our Saviour." Fcp. 8vo.

Classical and Miscellaneous.

Two volumes of "*The Collected Works of Dugald Stewart*," edited by Sir William Hamilton, have appeared. The whole work will contain nine volumes. All that the editor undertakes is to give an accurate and complete text, and to add everything from Stewart's unpublished manuscripts that is of value. The first volume contains the celebrated "Dissertation," with some additions, of which the editor speaks as follows:—

"In the present edition of the Dissertation, besides the concluding chapter of Part Third, and its relative note, which now appear for the first time, there are given numerous and extensive additions, both in the body of the work, and in the notes. These, as inserted, are all marked by their enclosure within brackets. They are, however, to be divided into two classes, as derived from different sources. In the first place, Mr. Stewart's own interleaved copy of the *original* edition of *both* parts of the Dissertation contributes various corrections and amplifications. These have all been made use of, and their insertion is simply indicated by the brackets. In the second place, the other authorities, from which new matter has been obtained, (but for Part *Second* only,) stand on a less favourable footing, in so far as whatever they afford, was, after being written, omitted by Mr. Stewart himself from the Dissertation as published. These omissions, however, seem to have been made under an anxiety to bring the work, as connected with the *Encyclopædia*, within a narrower compass, (see p. 201,) and not in consequence of any rejection of the passages as in themselves either erroneous or redundant. Their insertion is, therefore, now marked, not only by the brackets, but expressly as *restorations*, and though printed without other distinction, it should be mentioned that they also are

founded on *two* several documents. They are partly taken from the original *proof* of the Dissertation; it being explained that Mr. Stewart was in use to have the whole, or a large portion of an extended publication, set up at once in type, and on this, at his leisure, he made any alterations which he thought expedient. Such a proof of Part Second is preserved, and it supplies much that is new and valuable. Again, there remains of the same Part a copy of the author's *original manuscript*, which exhibits, in like manner, many passages which, though unpublished, merit preservation. Of this, it indeed appears that Mr. Stewart was fully sensible."

THE mere *opinion* of such a man as Professor OWEN is worth more, in a question of science, than long-drawn arguments by such novices as many of the recent writers against the unity of the human race—especially of such ignoramuses as "Gliddon and Nott." At the twenty-fourth meeting of the British Association for the Advancement of Science, Professor Owen delivered a lecture on the "Anthropoid Apes," in which, after indicating the distinctions that separate the most anthropoid of these apes from man, he showed that there was not any other character than those founded upon the developments of bone for the attachment of muscles, which was known to be subject to change through the operation of external causes; nine-tenths, therefore, of the differences, especially those very striking ones manifested by the pelvis and pelvic extremities, which Professor Owen had cited in his "Memoirs on the Orangs and Chimpanzees," published in the *Zoological Transactions*, as distinguishing the great chimpanzee from the human species, must stand in contravention of the hypothesis of transmutation and progressive development, until the supporters of that hypothesis are enabled to adduce the facts and cases which demonstrate the conditions of the modifications of such characters. There was the same kind of difficulty in accounting for the distinctive characters of the different species of the orangs and the chimpanzees, as for those more marked distinctions that remove both kinds of apes from man. And with regard to the number of the known species, Professor Owen remarked, It is not without interest to observe, that as the generic forms of the Quadrumana approach the Bimanous order, they are represented by fewer species. The gibbous (Hylobates) scarcely number more than half-a-dozen species; the orangs (Pithecus) have but two species, or at most three; the chimpanzees (Troglodytes) are represented by two species. The unity of the human species is demonstrated by the constancy of those osteological and dental characters to which the attention is more particularly directed in the investigation of the corresponding characters in the higher Quadrumana. Man is the sole species of his genus—the sole representative of his order: he has no nearer physical relations with the brute-kind than those which arise out of the characters that link together the great group of placental mammalia, called "Unguiculata." In conclusion, the professor briefly recounted the facts at present satisfactorily ascertained respecting the antiquity of the Quadrumana and of man upon the surface of the earth. At the time of the demise of Cuvier, in 1832, no evidence had been obtained of fossil Quadrumana, and the baron supposed that both these and the Bimana were of very recent introduction. Soon after the loss of that great re-constructor of extinct species, evidence with regard to the fossil Quadrumana was obtained from different quarters. In the oldest (eocene) tertiary deposits in Suffolk, specimens of jaws and teeth were found, that unerringly indicated the former existence of a species of monkey of the genus Macacus, (*Macacus cocenus.*) About the same time, the tertiary deposits from the Himalayan Mountains gave further evidence of the Quadrumana: jaws, astragali, and some other parts of the skeleton, having been found completely petrified, and referable to the genus called Semnopithecus, which is now restricted to the Asiatic continent. Dr. Lund discovered in Brazil fossil remains of an extinct platyrhine monkey, surpassing any known Cebus or Mycetes in size; the platyrhines are peculiar to South America. Lastly, in the middle tertiary series in the south of France was discovered a fragment of the lower jaw, proving that at that period some species of the long-armed ape (Hylobates) must have existed. But no fossil human remains have been found in the regularly deposited layers of any of the divisions (not even the pliocene) of the tertiary series. Human bones have been found in doubtful positions, geologically considered, such as deserted mines and caves, in the detritus at the bottom of cliffs; but never in tranquil undisturbed deposits, participating in the mineral characters of the undoubted

fossils of those deposits. The petrified negro skeletons in the calcareous concretes of Guadaloupe are of comparatively recent origin. Thus, therefore, in reference both to the unity of the human species, and to the fact of man being the latest, as he is the highest, of all animal forms upon our planet, the interpretations of God's works coincide with what has been revealed to us as to our own origin and zoological relations in his word. Of the nature of the creative acts by which the successive races of animals were called into being we are ignorant. But this we know, that as the evidence of unity of plan testifies to the oneness of the Creator, so the modifications of the plan for the different modes of existence illustrate the beneficence of the designer. Those structures, moreover, which are at present incomprehensible, as adaptations to a special end, are made comprehensible on a higher principle, and a final purpose is gained in relation to human intelligence; for, in the instances where the analogy of humanly-invented machines fails to explain the structure of a divinely-created organ, such organ does not exist in vain, if its truer comprehension in relation to the divine idea lead rational beings to a better conception of their own origin and Creator.—*Athenæum.*

Among the works recently announced in Great Britain are the following:—

History of French Literature in the Eighteenth Century. By Professor Vinet. Translated by the Rev. James Bryce. 8vo.:—Lord Carlisle's Diary in Turkish and Greek Waters. Post 8vo.:—Memoirs of James Montgomery: Including Selections from his Correspondence and Conversations. By John Holland and James Everett. Post 8vo.:—The Rev. R. I. Wilberforce's Inquiry into the Principles of Church Authority; or, Reasons for recalling his Subscription to the Royal Supremacy. 8vo.:—Piccadilly to Pera. By Capt. Oldmixon, R. N. With Illustrations in Colours. Post 8vo.:—The Baltic and the White Sea. By the Rev. T. Milner, M. A. With a Map of the Baltic Sea. Post 8vo.:—Thirty Years of Foreign Policy; or, a History of the Secretaryships of the Earl of Aberdeen and Viscount Palmerston. By the Author of the Biography of Mr. Disraeli. 8vo.:—The Geography of Herodotus Developed, Explained, and Illustrated from Modern Researches and Discoveries. By J. Talboys Wheeler, F. R. G. S. 8vo., with maps and plans:—The Second Volume of Chevalier Bunsen's Work on Ancient Egypt. Translated by C. H. Cottrell, M. A. With many Illustrations. 8vo.:—Turkey; its History and Progress: from the Journals and Correspondence of Sir James Porter, Fifteen Years Ambassador at Constantinople; continued to the Present Time, with a Memôir of Sir James Porter, by his Grandson, Sir George Larpent, Bart., &c. 2 vols. 8vo., with illustrations.

Among the new works in classical and general literature recently announced on the continent of Europe are the following:—

Histoire de l'administration monarchique en France depuis Philippe-Auguste jusqu'à Louis XIV (1180–1715); par M. *Chéruel,* maitre de conférences à l'Ecole normale supérieure (ouvrage couronné par l'Institut.) 2 vols., 8vo.

Dante et les origines de la langue et de la littérature Italiennes. Cours fait à la Faculté des lettres de Paris; par M. *Fauriel.* Paris: 2 vols., 8vo.

Essais de critique générale. Premier essai. Analyse générale de la connaissance. Bornes de la connaissance. Plus un appendice sur les principes généraux de la logique et des mathématiques; par *Ch. Renouvier.* Paris: 4 vols., 8vo.

Manuale juris synopticum in quo continentur Justiniani Institutiones, cum Gaii Institutionibus e regione oppositis perpetuo collatæ necnon Ulpiani Fragmenta, Pauli Sententiæ, Vaticana Fragmenta et aliæ plurimæ veterum jurisconsultorum reliquiæ. Concinnavit et recognovit *C. A. Pellat,* in Parisiensi juris Facultate juris romani professor et decanus. Paris: 1 vol., 18mo.

Lexicon persico-latinum etymologicum cum linguis maxime cognatis Sanscrita et Zendica et Pehlerica comparatum. Accedit appendix vocum dialecti antiquioris, Zend et Pazend dictæ, auct. J. A. Vullers. Fasc. III. 4to. (pp. 401–632.) Bonn (Marcus.)

Bopp, F. Vergleichendes Accentuationssystem nebst einer gedrängten Darstellung der grammatischen Uebereinstimmungen des Sanskrit und Griechischen. Berlin: pp. 304, 8vo.

Handbuch der Sanskritsprache. Zum Gebrauch f. Vorlesungen u. zum Selbststudium. Von Thd. Benfey. 2. Abth. Auch u. d. Tit.: Chrestomathie aus Sanskritwerken. 2. Thl. Glossar. Leipzig, 1854: pp. 374, 8vo.

Sanskrit-Wörterbuch. Von O. Böhtlingk u. Rud. Roth. Herausgeg. von der kaiserl. Akademie der Wissenschaften. 2. u. 3. Lief. St. Petersburg, 1854: imperial 4to.

THE
METHODIST QUARTERLY REVIEW.
APRIL, 1855.

Art. I.—MALACHI.

SECTION III, CHAP. ii, 17–iii, 6.

The coming of Christ and the Forerunner.

ii, 17. "Ye weary Jehovah with your words. And ye say, 'Wherein do we weary him?' In your saying, 'Every one who does evil is good in the eyes of Jehovah, and in them he delights;' or, 'Where is the God of judgment?'

iii, 1. "Behold, I send my messenger, and he shall prepare a way before me,
and suddenly there shall come to his temple the Lord, whom ye are
seeking, and the messenger of the covenant for whom ye are longing.
2. Behold he shall come, saith Jehovah of hosts. And who shall endure the
day of his coming? And who shall stand in his appearing? For he
3. shall be as a refiner's fire, and as a fuller's soap. And he shall sit, refining and purifying the silver, and shall purify the sons of Levi, and refine
them, as gold and as silver, and they shall be Jehovah's, offering sacrifice
4. in righteousness. And grateful to Jehovah shall be the sacrificial offering
of Judah and Jerusalem, as in the days of old, and as in the years of the
5. past. And I draw near to you for judgment, and I will be a swift witness against the sorcerers, and the adulterers, and those who swear to a
falsehood, and those who defraud the hireling of his wages, and the widow,
and the orphan, and those who oppress the stranger, and who fear not
6. me, saith Jehovah of hosts. For I am Jehovah, I change not, and you
(*therefore*) sons of Jacob are not consumed."

Chap. ii, 17. Here opens another count in this solemn indictment, the charge of an Epicurean scepticism, or a denial of the providence of God in human affairs, so far, at least, as their own condition was concerned.

There is no attribute of God more wonderful than his long-suffering. It has borne with a sinful world for six thousand years, with unwearied patience, and is even now waiting to be gracious. Hence when we read, as we do in this verse, that this attribute is exhausted, we infer that the wickedness which possessed such power as this, must have been very flagrant. What then is this enormity? Not

murder, or lust, or any of the most atrocious crimes of the human standard of guilt, but the abuse of the long-suffering itself as an indication that God was indifferent to sin. To pervert this very kindness into a pretext for so blasphemous a thought exhausted the kindness itself, and extorted from the prophet the indignant accusation, "Ye weary Jehovah with your words." The extent of their depravity is evinced by the mode in which this charge was met. It was not met with penitent regret, or even silence, but with the insolent challenge, "Wherein do we weary him?" What have we done so much worse than others that God charges us with wearying him? The prophet replies, that it was in saying that either God loved evil-doers, or there was no directing hand of a righteous God in the affairs of men.

The cause of this ungodly challenging of Divine Providence lay in the existing circumstances of the Jews. After they returned from the captivity, they continued, in spite of the efforts of Haggai and Zechariah, to neglect the more important duties of religion, while they discharged other lesser ones with superstitious punctiliousness. Because of the discharge of these minor duties, they conceived God as laid under obligation to prosper them. But because of the neglect of the higher duties God did not prosper them, even as much as surrounding heathen nations were prospered. Instead, however, of inferring that their peculiar privileges above the heathen brought after them peculiar guilt in the neglect of these privileges, and demanded peculiar punishment, they looked only at the few points of their obedience, and inferred that they were unjustly dealt with in not being rewarded for them. They therefore came to the monstrous conclusion, that either God loved and rewarded the evil-doer, like the surrounding heathen; or if not, "Where is the God of judgment?" Where is the proof that there is any directing hand of God in human affairs? Either there is no providence, or it favours the wicked. Hence they longed for the coming of that Messiah whom the prophets had promised, and whose coming was to bless the chosen people; supposing that when he came all these apparent anomalies would be rectified, and prosperity return to Israel. These delusions are corrected in the remainder of the section, when it is shown that this Messiah shall come; but his coming, so far from bestowing reward upon them in their sins, would only hasten their punishment, and bring about that final rejection which should scatter them like autumn leaves, all over the earth. The state of mind, therefore, which the prophet addresses, is not that of scepticism as to the ultimate coming of Messiah, as interpreters generally assume; but false views as to the

purpose and result of that coming. This is proved by chap. iii, 1, where they are said to be "seeking" him, and "longing" for his advent, not doubting it. It was not doubt about his coming, but delusion that he would correct. "He shall come as you expect, but not with the results that you expect." Such is so clearly the drift of the passage, that it is surprising that the other view should have obtained such universal prevalence.

Chap. iii, 1. In regard to this important verse several questions arise. Who is the messenger sent to prepare the way? Who is the Lord? Who is the messenger of the covenant? And what is the connexion of this passage with previous prophecies in the Old Testament, and the references to it in the New? An answer to the last question will aid us greatly in reaching an answer to the others, and therefore we address ourselves first to its consideration.

This passage is evidently founded on Isaiah xl, 3–5: "The voice of him that crieth in the wilderness, Prepare ye the way of the Lord," &c. This was probably a favourite passage with the Jewish people at this time, from which they drew their hopes of a Messiah, who should rectify all their anomalies and grant them a signal prosperity. Hence they looked anxiously for the promised forerunner who would herald his coming. Malachi assures them that this prophecy would be fulfilled—the forerunner and the Lord would both surely come as they were predicted. The voice was to cry from a wilderness, not in a literal sense so much as a figurative. The condition of the chosen people would be that of a wilderness—one of desolation and ruin. Now when that desolation was darkest and wildest the voice of summons should be heard calling upon them to prepare for the coming of the Lord. This voice is applied expressly to John the Baptist in Matthew iii, 3; Mark i, 3; Luke i, 76; iii, 4; and John i, 23. But the question arises, Is John alone referred to by this voice? Hengstenberg, Olshausen, and other expositors of note, say that he is not the only one referred to, but only the last one of a series. This is inferred from the use of the plural "our God," and from the fact that this preparation was really the work of all the prophets who prophesied until John, and not of John alone. The cry was the same, but it was taken from lip to lip along the whole line of prophets, until the last and greatest of them could say, "Behold the Lamb of God!"

In the citation of this prophecy in Mark i, 3, it is preceded by that of Malachi iii, 1, and there is a difficulty in the quotation that does not meet the eye of the English reader. The received text reads "as it is written in the prophets," which, as the quotations are from

both Malachi and Isaiah, presents no difficulty. But the true reading is admitted to be "as it is written in Isaiah the prophet," and hence the question arises, How can the passage from Malachi be referred to Isaiah? Hengstenberg explains it by the fact that the passage in Malachi rested on that in Isaiah, and hence the original was quoted, as it was the greater, as well as the older prophecy, to indicate this connexion. This is very ingenious, though Olshausen (on Matt. iii, 3) remarks, that it seems forced. The fact is, that as the minor prophets were regarded as but one book, they were rarely quoted by name, and where they were cited with one of the major prophets, the name of the latter was naturally given, especially as in this case, when the other evangelists had cited the major prophet by name. The omission, therefore, of the name of Malachi, is unimportant.

It is then plain from this brief reference to the relations of this text to Isaiah and the Gospels, that "the messenger" here predicted was John the Baptist. Mark quotes it with several verbal alterations to adapt it to his purpose in the use he makes of it. Christ expressly refers it to John the Baptist in Matthew xi, 10, and Luke vii, 27. Hence there can be no doubt in the mind of any believer in the claims of Christ, as to the proper reference of this text to John the Baptist. The only question is, whether it refers to him exclusively. Hengstenberg and others say here also, that it does not. Their reasons are, (1) the connexion with Isaiah xl, 3, where not an individual but a series is meant; (2) the word "behold," intimating a nearer connexion with the time of the prophet than the age of John; (3) the connexion of this passage with chap. iv, 5, that predicts the coming of Elijah, which, as we shall see, is the strongest reason of the three. By this interpretation the word "messenger" is applied to that long series that ended in John, to all of whom this preparatory work was assigned. The prophecy was really fulfilled in John, though not exhausted by him, but possessing a continuous fulfilment all along the history of the past. The work of John was too narrow to meet the sweep of the predictions of this prophecy. Hence, when he appeared in the wilderness, fasting, and clothed in the wild garb of the old prophets, he appeared rather as a symbol to gather in his own case all the scattered delineations of prophecy, and explain their meaning and application, than as himself the end and object of these prophecies. His appearance was not so much a mere fulfilment of prophecy, as a reëxistence of all its awful and glorious voices, couched under obvious symbols. The Jewish people were in a state of desolation, all the bloom of their civil and spiritual life withered, and their hearts as hard as the

parched wilderness. Hence, when John took up his abode in the wilderness, he presented to the people a vast and silent symbol of their condition. He came, clothed in a garb of penitence, like the elder prophets, and eating a diet of penitence, to present a symbol of the great duty of the people, *repentance.* He then proclaimed the near approach of the Messiah, thus gathering up the three great topics of prophecy, sin, repentance, and salvation, and presenting them for the last time before the coming of the expected One. His ministry was therefore a symbolical epitome of all that had gone before, in the prophetic teachings of God to the Church; and hence he was, as the last representative of this long line of embassadors from God, preëminently the messenger.

Who then is meant by "the Lord" הָאָדוֹן? We reply, God; because אָדוֹן with the article always has this meaning. See Exod. xxiii, 17; xxxiv, 23; Isa. i, 24; iii, 1; x, 16, 33, &c. In Dan. ix, 17, it seems to mean the Son, where the prophet prays to God to grant his request, for the Lord's sake. The fact that God is the speaker proves the same thing; for after declaring the way shall be prepared "before *me*," he adds that the Lord should come, thus identifying the Lord with himself.

There is now but little difficulty in determining who is meant by the "messenger of the covenant." The authority of the New Testament settles it to be the Messiah, Jesus Christ. The "covenant" here does not mean any specific outward transaction between God and the Jews, but that deeper inward relation which he has to the whole Church, involving, as it does, the great purpose and plan of redemption, of which Christ was the executive agent. In distinction from this national covenant, Christ is called "the Mediator of the new covenant," Heb. xii, 24; in allusion to such passages as this one, Jer. xxxi, 31, &c. He is called the "messenger" or "angel" of the covenant, in allusion to Exod. xxiii, 20, where the Jehovah Angel is promised as the guide of the people. This angel is thus identified with the Shekinah, that went before the tribes, dwelt in the tabernacle, and afterward in the temple, through which all the manifestations in the Old Testament were made. This text, compared with Mark i, 2, identifies this angel with Christ, proving thus, that all the theophanies of the Old Testament were through the Son, who became flesh, and dwelt among us. Those who wish to pursue this interesting theme more fully, will find it very ably discussed in the Lectures on Divinity, by Principal Hill, of St. Andrews. (Book iii, chap. v, sec. 1–3.) The bearing of this point on the Socinian controversy is obviously very important, for if this is established, it follows irresistibly that Christ is God.

The words "for whom ye are longing," show clearly that the state of mind existing then was delusion and not doubt, as is commonly stated. They longed for Messiah to bring those temporal blessings which Jehovah had not bestowed on them yet, and the prophet corrects their error as to the purpose of his coming. To assume, as the expositors do, that only the pious portion of the people thus longed for him, is perfectly unauthorized and arbitrary, for the very persons longing thus, are those reproved for sin, and threatened with his coming The temple here is not necessarily to be limited to the literal temple, any more than the wilderness in which the other messenger was to appear. The theocratic people, the Church, is sometimes called the temple of the Lord. (See Jer. vii, 4; and especially Zech. vi, 12, 13, 15, which is exactly parallel to this passage.) The Church is frequently so called in the New Testament. (See 2 Cor. vi, 16; 2 Thess. ii, 4; Rev. iii, 12, &c.) The literal temple was only a symbol of this spiritual temple, built on the foundation of the apostles and prophets, with Jesus Christ as the chief corner-stone.

Ver. 2. "The day of his coming," and his "appearing," are not to be limited to the first advent of Messiah, but to his entire work, including the whole dispensation that shall end with the judgment. The "day of his coming" is parallel to "the day of the Lord" mentioned so frequently in the prophets, (see Amos v, 18; Joel ii, 11, &c.,) and afterward called "the great and dreadful day of the Lord" in chap. iv, 5, where it is obviously identical with the day spoken of here. This is further proved by the allusions to this text in the New Testament, *e. g.*, Luke xxi, 34, 36; Eph. vi, 13; and Rev. vi, 16, 17, where this "standing" at his appearing is referred to a period yet future. The mission of Christ is regarded as a whole, from the manger of Bethlehem to the throne of judgment, and declared to be for the fall as well as for the rising of many in Israel, a work that should separate the pure from the impure, just as the refiner's fire and the fuller's washing lye, or potash. This process began during the life of our Lord on earth; it has been going on ever since; and will continue until the final separation, of which we have so solemn a description from the lips of Christ himself in Matt. xxv, 31–46.

Ver. 3 takes up the metaphor of verse 2, and, slightly altering it, gives it more distinctness, and presents us with an image of exquisite beauty. When the ore is cast into the glowing crucible, it seems as if it were to be destroyed, and could it reason, it would, like Christians when put into the furnace of affliction, infer that the result and design must be destruction. But when the process is ended, that which went in cold, sordid, and impure, comes forth

bright, glowing, and unalloyed. And the refiner is beautifully represented as coming and sitting down beside the crucible, that the fire may not be too hot, or the process left incomplete. He bends in patient love over the furnace, until, (in the rule given to the Manchester ladies, who sought an illustration of this text in a refiner's shop,) when he looks down on the liquid metal, he can see his own image perfectly reflected there; then the process is completed, and the fire removed. The Old Testament images of "sons of Levi," "sacrifice," &c., are here used to express New Testament facts with obvious propriety. לַיהוָֹה means belonging to the Lord, including their own joyful acknowledgment of this fact.

Ver. 4 declares the result of this process, that the offerings of the people shall be grateful to God. These sacrifices are of course eucharistic and not expiatory, such as are mentioned in Rom. xii, 1; 1 Peter ii, 5, &c.

Ver. 5 refers to the godless cavil of chap. ii, 17, "Where is the God of judgment?" as if he was totally removed from all notice of human affairs. God says that he is near to them for judgment, and a swift witness against their crimes, committed against their helpless wives and dependents. He may seem not to notice sin, and to delay its punishment, but all the time his sleepless eye is noting the sinner, and his thunder but grows hotter the longer it sleeps. While these impious cavillers were inferring that God did not hate sin, because he did not punish others, they would suddenly receive a proof of his justice in his punishing themselves. The first three crimes were against their wives; sorcery was connected with the idolatrous worship to which their heathen wives allured them, and was a common practice among the later Jews, as appears from Acts viii, 9; xiii, 6; and also from Josephus, (Arch. xx, 6; B. Jud. ii, 12, 23,) quoted by Hengstenberg. The other crimes were against the unprotected, of whom God touchingly represents himself as the protector and avenger; oppression of the helpless is defiance of God. The root of their crimes is traced in the fact that they do not fear God—a crime whose folly seems even greater, if possible, than its wickedness.

Ver. 6. The exact force of כִּי in this verse is somewhat obscure. It must be taken as a causal particle, introducing a reason for, or an inference from what precedes. The connection is probably as follows:—In view of this prevalent wickedness, there were two conclusions that might be drawn. First, that of the sceptic—that God had ceased to punish sin, since the sinning people still continued to exist; and secondly, that of the timid believer—that with so much sin, Israel must be destroyed. God replies that neither of these conclu-

sions is correct. "They are spared and not consumed, because I am Jehovah, the covenant God of their fathers, and they, sons of Jacob, to whom I am bound by covenant; and while I spare them, I will also punish them, and while I punish them, I will also preserve them from total extinction!" The stress of the verse, then, is found in the meaning of יהֹוָה, which was the covenant name of God to the Jews, as is clearly proved by the remarkable—and on any other hypothesis inexplicable—passage, Exod. vi, 3; and is here used in antithesis with Jacob, the covenanting head of the visible theocracy. So when the Church grows cold, and there shall be no faith on the earth, the hope of the Christian must be founded, not on the visible tokens of either impunity or gathering doom, but on the unchanging love of God, who will not allow the gates of hell to prevail against her. The immutability of God, then, is at once the guarantee that his people shall be cast into the furnace, and also that they shall not be consumed.

Some of the solemn lessons of this section are, that one of the greatest sins we can commit, is to infer that the inequality of human condition is a proof that God is indifferent to human conduct. The inference is unfair on a sufficiently extensive induction of facts, if we know nothing of God, but most atrociously wicked, even if more plausible, in view of what we actually know of him as a righteous ruler. Chap. ii, 17.

The remedial dispensation of God's mercy in Christ has two aspects—one of wrath, the other of love. The Angel of the Covenant is the same that led the people out from Egypt; and like that cloud-girt presence of Jehovah, it has an aspect of terror to the foes of God, while it has an aspect of love to his friends. The gradual dispensation of the gospel is separating the gold of the earth from its dross, in the mass of men, and doing the same refining work in every Christian heart. When the separating process is complete in the one case, the world will end; when in the other, the fire will be put out in the furnace of affliction, and the purified spirit brought out of the crucible. Chap. iii, 1–3.

It is not enough to desire the coming of Christ. Many desire it, to whom it will be a dreadful apocalypse of wrath. Chap. ii, 17.

The helpless, who have no human protector, have a mightier and surer one in God. He may allow them to be oppressed for a time, but in the end will visit swift and terrible judgment on their oppressors. Chap. iii, 5.

Let not the Christian heart grow timid in a time of prevalent wickedness and unbelief, in the fear that the ark of God may perish. The sons of Jacob shall not be consumed—the seed of Christ shall

not perish. The unchangeableness of God is the sheet-anchor of the Church. He will be faithful to his Son, and to his word, however disheartening external circumstances may appear to our wavering faith. Chap. iii, 6.

SECTION IV, CHAP. iii, 7–12.

Neglect of Tithes and Offerings.

iii, 7. "From the days of your fathers ye have departed from my statutes, and
have not kept them. Return unto me, and I will return unto you, saith
8. Jehovah of hosts. And ye say, 'Wherein shall we return?' Will a man
defraud God? Because ye have defrauded me. And ye say, 'Wherein
9. have we defrauded thee?' In tithes and offerings. Ye are cursed with
10. a curse; for me have ye defrauded, the whole nation (*of you*). Bring
all the tithes into the house of the treasury, and let there be food in my
house, and prove me, I pray you, in this, saith Jehovah of hosts, if I will
not open to you the flood-gates of heaven, and pour down upon you a bless-
11. ing perpetually. And I will rebuke for you the devourer, and it shall not
destroy for you the fruits of the ground, and it shall not blight for you the
12. vine in the field, saith Jehovah of hosts. And all nations shall pronounce
you blessed, for ye shall be a land of delight, saith Jehovah of hosts."

Ver. 7. It is a principle in God's government, that the sins of the fathers should be visited upon the children, in order that parental affection may be an additional restraint against sin. Now the Jews having begun their wanderings after returning from captivity, at the point where their fathers had left off, instead of repenting of and forsaking their sins, this law of hereditary guilt was allowed to take its course. God, however, assures them that if they return to him in penitence, he will return to them in prosperity. They then, with the same stolid impenitence that they have all along shown, ask wherein they were to return—as if the accusation of departure was a calumny.

Ver. 8 answers this insolent question with a burst of indignant invective. What, when the cry of your injured wives, the ruins of the holy city, and the neglected altars of the temple, are all telling of your having withheld from God his dues, do you ask wherein you must return? Will a man defraud God, and yet think that he has nothing to repent of? The word קָבַע having the radical sense of covering or hiding, is properly *to defraud*, rather than *to rob*. The force of כִּי seems to be as follows: "Can you think that sacrilege is not a crime to be repented of? Yet you have committed that crime, because ye have defrauded me." Again the hardened insolence of the people rears its brow, and demands wherein this fraud had been committed? And God answers, "In tithes and offerings." The tithes required by the Mosaic law were, first, a tenth of all that remained after the first fruits, (which belonged to God and must be

given to him,) which tenth was God's, as the original proprietor of the soil, and was to be paid to the Levites for their maintenance. Lev. xxvii, 30–32. Secondly, from this tenth the Levites paid a tenth to the priests. Num. xviii, 26–28. Thirdly, a second tenth was paid by the people for the entertainment of the Levites and their own families at the tabernacle. Deut. xii, 18. Fourthly, another tithe was paid every third year for the poor, widows, orphans, &c. Deut. xiv, 28, 29. The first three classes of tithes are specially referred to here, as appears from the context, though the fourth was also withheld as we would infer from chap. iii, 5. "The offerings" are referred to in chap. i, 7–14.

Ver. 9 states that, because of this defrauding of God, the people were cursed, as already stated in chap. ii, 2. The position of "me" we regard as emphatic, designed to intimate the enormity of the attempt to defraud God. For the syntax of וְ, which is here taken causally, see Nordheimer, § 1093, 6, *e. a.*

Ver. 10 contains God's challenge: Be faithful to God, and see whether he will not be faithful to his promises. "All the tithes:" (see under ver. 8 what these were.) The phrase עַד־בְּלִי־דָי has been variously rendered; literally it means, "until a failure of sufficiency," and the interpretation depends on the exact reference of sufficiency. Our version understands sufficiency of room to receive the blessing; but it seems most natural to refer it to the source of this sufficiency, viz., God. This makes it precisely analogous to the corresponding passage where this idiom occurs, (Psa. lxxii, 5,) "Until a failure of the moon," *i. e.*, as long as the moon endures, which was equivalent to saying perpetually: so here it would be equivalent to, "as long as the sufficiency of God endures;" and as this sufficiency is infinite, it means perpetually. We have preferred to translate the idiom into its proper equivalent in our language. The reasoning is, that constant obedience will produce a constant shower of blessing; the exact meaning of the phrase being *perpetuity* of blessing, rather than *abundance* of blessing, as it is commonly rendered, a thought which was sufficiently expressed by the words "pour down" and "flood-gates of heaven."

Ver. 11. "The devourer" is not any specific kind of destroyer, but any and every one, rational or irrational. The allusion is to the threat of chap. ii, 3, which is here specifically revoked, on condition of repentance and obedience.

Ver. 12 promises a blessing in the same form in which it is promised in Deut. xxxiii, 29; Zech. viii, 13.

The doctrine of this section is, that the man who defrauds God defrauds himself—the Christian who keeps back the time, the toil,

and the treasure that God claims of him, will be in the end the greatest loser. We fear that there are many tithes yet withheld from the treasury of the Lord, and that this is one great cause of the barrenness and deadness of the Church. The flood-gates of spiritual influence are closed, and the heavens are to us as brass, because we have defrauded the Lord's pensioners and the Lord's house. Let Christians only take God at his word, and prove him in this matter—be whole-hearted and whole-handed Christians—and see if the cloud will not rise over Carmel, and the heavens grow black with rain.

SECTION V, CHAP. iii, 13–END.

Reproofs and Warnings.

13. "'Your words have been violent against me,' saith Jehovah. And ye
14. say, 'What do we say against thee?' Ye say, 'It is vain to serve God, and
what profit (*is it*,) that we have kept his observances, and that we have
15. walked mournfully before Jehovah of hosts? And now we pronounce the
proud happy; they are built up, the workers of iniquity: also, they tempt
God, and escape.'
16. Then they who feared Jehovah, spake, every man to his neighbour; and
Jehovah attended and heard: and there was written a book of remembrance
before him, for those who feared Jehovah, and for those who thought
17. upon his name. And they shall be mine, saith Jehovah of hosts, in the
day in which I shall make up my possession, and I will spare them, as a
18. man spares his son that serves him. And ye shall return and discern
(*the difference*) between the righteous and the wicked, and between him
iv, 1. who serves Jehovah, and him who serves him not. For behold! the day
comes! burning like a furnace! and all the proud, and all the doers of
evil are chaff! and the day that comes, burns them, saith Jehovah of
2. hosts, who will not leave to them root nor branch. And then shall rise
on you who fear my name the Sun of righteousness, and healing in his
3. wings, and ye shall go forth and leap as calves of the stall. And ye shall
trample down the ungodly; for they shall be ashes under the soles of your
4. feet in the day which I make, saith Jehovah of hosts. Remember the law
of Moses, my servant, which I commanded him in Horeb, for all Israel.
statutes and judgments.
5. Behold! I send to you Elijah the prophet, before the day of Jehovah
6. comes, the great and the terrible! And he shall return the heart of the
fathers to the sons, and the heart of the sons to the fathers, lest I come
and smite the land with a curse."

The passage (ver. 13–15) repeats in a more aggravated form, the sin of the ungodly Jews, reproved in the previous portion of the prophecy. That sin was—charging God with partiality and injustice, because he did not reward them for their mercenary and imperfect obedience, while the heathen seemed to be so much more prosperous. There is a sort of climax in the utterance of their feelings. At first, their murmurings were such as to cause God to say that he had no pleasure in them. Chap. i, 10. Then their unreasonable

pertinacity was such that their words wearied him. Chap. ii, 17. But now their insolence arises so high as to amount to audacious violence. Chap. iii, 13. The error, lying at the root of all this, was a mistake in regard to the nature of God's service, and converting it into a mere mercenary kind of worldliness, supposing that, if it did not reward, in the good things of this life, all those who performed its outward observances, whatever was the motive of these performances, it was a failure. They mistook, at once, the spiritual motives and feelings required, and the eternal rewards promised to those who served God. This selfish estimate of religion, and disposition to test it by the worldly prosperity it confers, is one of the tendencies of the human heart that did not cease with the calculating religionists of the times of Malachi.

Ver. 13. חָזַק with עַל is literally to be *strong upon* any one, *i. e.*, to be violent. It represents the aggravated insult contained in the words of the Jews, as if they really forced God to punish them. נִדְבַּרְנוּ, being the Niphal form of the verb, has the reciprocal sense of this conjugation, (see Nordheimer, vol. i, p. 94, § 141, 3,) and implies that these things were said—not directly *to* God—but *of* God, to one another. For this meaning of the word, see Ezek. xxxiii, 30, where it is fully explained in the context.

Ver. 14 expresses the corrupt feelings, the utterance of which had so insulted God. They had engaged in the discharge of duty, not from any love to God, but from a hope of being well paid for it; and when they found that God did not pay them as they expected, they murmured, and charged him with being unjust. Their error, however, was not in thinking that God would reward those who faithfully served him, but in thinking that such beggarly services as theirs, arising from such ignoble motives, had any claim on God's favour. "To walk mournfully" was to assume the garb of penitence, which was the garb used by mourners. They had even submitted to fasting and humiliation, and yet had not been paid for it, forgetting the teaching of Isaiah lviii, in regard to the fast which God had chosen.

Ver. 15 is a continuation of the conversation of the people with one another. "And now" expresses the inference they stated to each other, as to be drawn from their adversity as compared with the prosperity of the heathen. "Since we are not rewarded, who serve Jehovah, and the proud heathen flourish in prosperity, we must now pronounce them the favourites of God, and say that he builds up the workers of iniquity, and allows them, who dare him to punish them, by breaking his laws, to escape." This atrocious insinuation, that God favoured evil-doers, was the highest insult they could have

uttered, and was that which, as it were, drove God to inflict his judgments upon them.

Ver. 16. It is a cheering thought that no defection from the truth has ever been so wide spread, as not to leave a remnant who never bowed the knee to Baal. Such was the fact here. Amid the astounding wickedness of the people, there were still those who were faithful to God. Their *character* is described as those "who feared Jehovah." This fear is not the fear of terror or guilt, but the fear of a love that is always tremblingly alive to the possible alienation of its object. Their *conduct* is also described: "They spake one to another." While the wicked spake to one another words of daring scepticism, they who feared the Lord were speaking to each other words of encouragement and faith. Maurer and Hitzig endeavour to show that the persons referred to in this verse are the same with those spoken of in verses 13–15. But the promises in verses 16, 17 are plainly inconsistent with the heavy condemnation implied in verse 13. The reward of this fidelity is then stated. The kings of Persia were accustomed to enter in a book the names of those who had rendered any special service to the king in order that they might be duly rewarded. See Esther vi, 1. This, or the books in Daniel vii, 10, may be referred to here, to express the fact that their fidelity would not be overlooked. The faintest whisper which they utter in the ears of each other will be heard and recorded in heaven.

Ver. 17. The word סְגֻלָּה in the English version is rendered "jewels;" but it strictly means "a possession," implying some special value, though without limiting it to the precise kind of valuables indicated by the word jewels. It will admit of two constructions. The first is that preferred by Maurer and the older interpreters, which connects it with וְהָיוּ לִי, and gives the sense, "They shall be my possession in the day that I shall make." This construction is at variance with the accents, and does not give that fulness of significance to the promise that seems to be demanded by its terms. Hence the other construction is preferable, which declares that in that great day of final adjustment, when God shall make up his own peculiar people from the assembled millions of the earth, then these humble and fearing followers of Jehovah, in the midst of abounding wickedness, shall be his; and when the threatened wrath begins to consume the enemies of God, he will spare them with all a father's yearning fondness for a docile and loving child. Thus the prophet carries the mind forward to the mighty adjustments of the future, in which all the seeming anomalies of the present shall be fully explained and wholly removed forever.

Ver. 18 expresses this fact: "Now you murmur at the ways of

God as unjust in seemingly confounding the righteous and wicked, thus refusing to him the justice you concede to a man, not to condemn an unfinished plan, because it seems to you to be objectionable. It is in part to test your disposition to trust God in spite of all appearances that perplex, and to make your service of him less mercenary and selfish, that this blended state of facts is allowed. But when the experiment has been fully made, and it is thus seen who will be faithful in the face of perplexity, and who will be otherwise, then shall you see clearly that there is a difference between the righteous and the wicked as broad as the abyss between heaven and hell."

Chap. iv, 1. In this verse we have a prophecy that requires the application of what we may call the principle of successive fulfilment. This is one of great importance in interpreting the Bible, if we would avoid confusion. There are a number of statements by the sacred writers that are designed to apply to distinct facts, successively occurring in history. If the words are limited to any one of these facts, they will seem exaggerated, for no one fact can exhaust their significance. They must be spread over all the facts before their plenary meaning is reached. There is nothing in this principle that is at variance with the ordinary laws of language. The same general use of phrases occurs repeatedly. Thus, Berkeley's celebrated line, "Westward the star of empire takes its way," is fulfilled with every new advance of occidental greatness, and includes the smallest as well as the greatest facts of this nature. The expression, "The schoolmaster is abroad," has its fulfilment in every successive teacher of youth who goes forth to his work. Every language contains these formulas, which refer not to any one event, but a series of events, all embodying the same principle, or resulting from the same cause. Hence, there is nothing in this principle at variance with the laws of language.

We find repeated instances of this species of prediction in the Scriptures. The promise in regard to the "Seed of the woman," (Gen. iii, 15,) refers to no one event, but runs along the whole stream of history, and includes every successive conquest of the religion of Christ. The same thing is true of the promise, that men shall beat their swords into ploughshares; and kindred predictions of the peace that shall ensue in Messianic times. They refer to every advance that is made in the peaceful tendencies of the religion of the Bible, and await their fullest fulfilment in the future.

There is a class of predictions in interpreting which this principle is eminently important. It is that which refers to what the old theologians called the *novissima*, to which this verse belongs. When

Christ speaks of these last things, he does it in terms that obviously refer to the destruction of Jerusalem, and yet as obviously transcend that event. This has led to the Universalist dogma, that there is no day of judgment, except in that indefinite sense in which every judicial visitation of God is a day of judgment, just as every gracious visitation of God is a day of grace. Relying on the indefinite use of the word day in Scripture, they seek to eviscerate these predictions of a future day of judgment of all the tremendous significance that they have commonly possessed. They refer to the fact that Peter applied Joel's prediction of the day of the Lord to the events of Pentecost, in Acts ii, 16; and from thence infer that the formula "day of the Lord" cannot be applied to a future judgment, as it is commonly held. The difficulty which they press, however, can be wholly removed by adopting this principle of successive fulfilment. It is true that the deluge, the destruction of Sodom, Babylon, and Jerusalem, and all subsequent visitations of God's wrath, were days of the Lord, and in each one of them the proud and evil-doers were as chaff. But as each one did not exhaust these ominous predictions, so all together have not yet met the full reach of the terrors, which will only be done in that future day in which the Lord shall descend from heaven with a shout, with the voice of the archangel and the trump of God, and the drama of earth shall be ended. All previous judgments were but reddenings of the dawn, that betokened the coming, but did not unfold the terrible brightness of that awful day. As the prophet in this verse gazes upon its distant rising, he exclaims, as if in breathless emotion, It comes! burning like a furnace! the wicked proud are chaff! the day burns them! There is something very forcible in these abrupt exclamations, as if the prophet was elevated on some mount of vision, and actually beheld this terrible pomp come rolling up the distant skies, with its reddening pathway of fire and blood. The finality of this day is distinctly declared in the utter ruin that it is predicted to bring.

Ver. 2 presents the situation of the righteous in this future day of terror, as contrasted with that of the wicked. To the wicked, the day should come fierce and consuming as a furnace; to the righteous, it should dawn in peace, and the sun that should illumine it would be, not one of condemnation, but of "righteousness,"—not one of destruction, but of "healing." Wings are attributed to the sun, poetically, in allusion to his apparent motion, just as we read of "the wings of the morning," in Psa. cxxxix, 9. The image of the sun seems to have been suggested by the expression "day," used in the preceding verse, in order to make the contrast more striking between the day of terror to the wicked, and of gladness to the right-

eous. The phrase "Sun of righteousness" is generally applied to Christ in popular language, and if the ultimate ground of this future gladness and righteousness is brought in view, the phrase is undoubtedly applicable to him. But we cannot think that the prophet here meant to predict Christ personally by this phrase, or indeed to look at the ground of this righteousness at all. His object was to show the contrast that this future day would present to the righteous, from the aspect it would present to the wicked; and while it is true that the foundation of this contrast rests on Christ, yet it is the contrast itself, in its bright and joyous character, rather than the foundation that is here contemplated by the prophet. To leap as a young animal, which after confinement exults in the joyousness of freedom, is a striking image of the joy that the righteous shall feel after being kept so long waiting for deliverance.

Ver. 3 is designed to meet the perplexity of the righteous, in view of the prosperity of the wicked. That prosperity would be brief, and soon reversed. The image of ashes refers us back to that of fire in ver. 1, which was to consume the ungodly.

Ver. 4 expresses the condition on which this future blessing would be bestowed, namely, obedience. Obey the law already given, and at the proper time it shall be found, that in the end it shall be well with the righteous, for the reward of his hands shall be given him.

Ver. 5. The main difficulty in this verse, is, to answer the question, Who, or what is Elijah? Is he the Tishbite, who is personally to reappear on earth? So the Jews, and even some of the early Christian fathers, thought. But the reference by Christ himself of this passage to John, proves that this could not be its meaning. Indeed, the fact that he is called "the prophet," and not "the Tishbite," implies that it is his official, and not his personal relations, that are here contemplated. If, then, it is not Elijah personally, is it John personally that is here predicted under the name Elijah? This view of the case is contradicted by the express assertion of John. When, in evident allusion to this passage, he was asked, (John i, 21,) "Art thou Elias?" he replied, "I am not;" and then, as if to meet the supposition, that he might thus only mean to deny that he was Elijah reappearing on the earth, when he was asked further, "Art thou that prophet?" (the article here must be taken as emphatic,) he replies, "No," thus asserting that none of these prophecies found an exhaustive fulfilment in him individually. The Jews supposed that this prophecy would be fulfilled finally in a single individual, and that when this individual would come, the time of Israel's glory was near at hand. It was this false view of the passage that John denied, and not any reference of it to him. He must have

known, from the communication of the angel to his father, (Luke i, 16, 17,) that this prophecy had a reference to him, and his adoption of the costume of Elijah proved the same thing; hence it could only have been the exclusive application of the text to him that he meant to deny.

In what sense then is Elijah predicted? The fact that John, to whom the passage is applied by Christ, calls himself "the voice crying in the wilderness," which we have seen (Mal. iii, 1) to be identical with "the messenger" then predicted, proves that Elijah is here to be understood in the same sense with "the messenger." We are here therefore presented with another case of successive fulfilment, such as we found in ver. 1. Indeed, this is expressly intimated when we are told that John was to come in "the spirit and power of Elijah." Luke i, 16, 17. As Moses in the preceding verse was taken as the representative of the law, the preceptive revealings of God, so Elijah is taken as the representative of the prophets, or the prophetic revealings of God. This was done again in the transfiguration, where these men appear in their representative and not in their personal character. This use of Elijah is not unknown to the Old Testament; in 2 Chron. xxi, 12, it is said that "a writing from Elijah the prophet" came to King Jehoram, when Elijah had been for many years in heaven. This can only mean a prophecy, in the spirit of Elijah. So in 1 Kings xix, 15, 16, it is predicted that Elijah shall do acts that in fact were done by Elisha (2 Kings viii, 13) and one of the young prophets. 2 Kings ix, 13. This also implies that Elijah was taken as a representative of the prophetic order, or more strictly, of the spirit of prophecy. This prophetic mission was to reprove, to instruct, to warn, and to predict. The general fact, then, that is predicted, is, that before God comes in his terrible mission of judgment, he will send agencies to revive and reform his people, so that they may escape from the wrath to come. Were it announced to us that before God would cut off an apostate Church, he would send a Luther, we should instantly comprehend the meaning of the prediction, and see no confusion of language, but rather a greater clearness in this use of a typical or representative man. Thus, then, it is predicted, that before God sends wrath, he will send messengers to summon to repentance. This was done before the downfall of the Jewish people. John, as the first of these sent messengers, had especial prominence, but he was not the last; others followed with the same message, "Repent, for the day is coming!" And in every subsequent revival of religion in the Church it has been so. In the reformation of the sixteenth century, Elijah came in the burning words of Luther, Calvin, and Knox; in the eighteenth, in the fervid spirits of

the Wesleys, Whitefield, and Edwards; and now that we are verging upon yet more fearful unfoldings of the wrathful visitations of God on the earth, we look for Elijah to come forth again in some new and mighty awakening of men to repentance. Indeed, to every regenerated soul there is essentially this coming of Elijah, this summons, "Repent, for the day is coming!" And as the faithful minister of Christ goes forth, it must ever be in this same spirit, calling on men to repent, and pointing to the lurid flashings of that *dies iræ*, which, when once perceived by the startled eye of the soul, will lead it to flee to the only refuge from this wrath to come. We thus see, that instead of a narrow prediction that is exhausted by its application to a single man, and that confuses us by this restriction, we have a magnificent formula of the spiritual world, that stretches like a law over all its phases, and gives unity to them all, from the most mighty to the most minute.

Ver. 6 describes the work of the preacher of repentance. The expression, "return the heart of the fathers to the sons, and the heart of the sons to the fathers," has usually been explained to mean the restoration of domestic harmony among the people. But this is a very meagre sense of words that close up the utterances of God to his people for twelve generations. Want of domestic concord was not one of the sins charged upon the people, and its removal would hardly be the great work assigned to the Elijah messenger. The meaning is suggested in the words of the angel to Zacharias, in Luke i, 16, 17; where, instead of the clause, "the heart of the sons to the fathers," is put, "the disobedient to the wisdom of the just." This paraphrase indicates that the hearts of the devoted ancestors were to live again in the obedience of their repentant posterity, and that the backslidden sons were to be restored to the piety of their fathers. The piety of the fathers had been referred to repeatedly before, (see i, 2; ii, 5, 6; iii, 4,) and the promise is, that this piety should live again in the children, under the Elijah call to repentance; and it is threatened, that if this is not the result, the land shall be laid under the terrible *harem*. This was a devotion to destruction, such as was done to the Canaanites by the judicial act of God. As these guilty nations were cut off because of their sins, so should the people who had taken their place on the soil of the land of promise, or those who in turn would take their place on the covenants of promise, if they imitated their sinful example. This was fulfilled five hundred years afterward, when the chosen people were finally rejected, and the awful blood was upon them and their children, according to their own imprecation. And to this hour, the soil that was wet with that blood lies under the terrible *harem*, and will so continue, until that Elijah

call that shall bring back the heart of David, of Isaiah, and of Nathanael to their exiled posterity, enabling them to see him whom they have pierced, and to cry, "My Lord and my God." And by the same principle of interpretation that we have applied to the previous verse, do we extend this warning to every age of the Church, and find in it the germ of the solemn admonition of Paul in discussing the same subject, (Rom. xi, 20, 21,) "Be not high-minded, but fear; for if God spared not the natural branches, take heed, lest he also spare not thee."

The reproofs and warnings of this section are eminently applicable to our Epicurean age. There is the same tendency to challenge the dealings of God now that there was then, and there is the same need to point men forward to the mighty adjustments of the future, in which all these apparent anomalies will be rectified, and to urge them to listen to the heavenly voice that calls them to repent, believe, and obey, assuring them that if any man love not the Lord Jesus Christ, he is *Anathema, Maran-atha*! And it is suggestive of much solemn thought, that the last utterance of God to the Church and to the world, before the coming of the Messiah, the word that was to sound through four hundred years of history, was that awful word "*curse!*"

Art. II.—CURTIS'S HISTORY OF THE CONSTITUTION.

History of the Origin, Formation, and Adoption of the Constitution of the United States, with Notices of its Principal Framers. By George Ticknor Curtis. In two vols. Vol. I. New-York: Harper & Brothers, 1854. 8vo., pp. 488.

The English Constitution is the aggregate of all the fundamental laws, usages, and institutions under which the people of England live. The Constitution of the United States is something very different. It is not the aggregate of *all* our laws and institutions, nor even of the larger portion of them. The law with which we most frequently come in contact, which governs most of our ordinary transactions, and to which we oftenest have occasion to appeal, emanates from the particular state in which we reside, and is not at all affected by the circumstance that we are also subject to another jurisdiction, and to a second fundamental law, which regulates the remainder of our ordinary concerns. There is a division of *the matter* of sovereignty, not of the sovereignty itself, between two distinct powers, which touch us, so to speak, on opposite sides. The one is not superior, and

the other inferior; each, within its own domain, is absolute sovereign. The state, for instance, cannot interfere with a law of Congress regulating commerce; Congress, on the other hand, cannot interfere with a state law regulating the descent of property. The state cannot coin money; the United States cannot train the militia, nor appoint its officers. Even the matter of the punishment of crimes is divided between the two authorities; sometimes a man is hanged by the United States marshal and his deputies, sometimes by the county sheriff, who is a state officer.

Such a double-headed government is an anomaly among nations. Nothing like it exists anywhere else upon earth, and nothing like it is recorded in history. It is not a mere confederation of otherwise independent states, such as existed under the Amphictyonic Council, the Achaian League, the empire of Germany, or such as now exists among the several cantons of Switzerland. The essence of such a league is, that the states themselves—the several political communities in their corporate capacities—are the only parties to it; the regulation of the league affecting these states alone, and never touching the individuals who make up any one of those states. A confederacy, or league, is an association of states; a government implies an association of individuals. Now the United States in their collective capacity form one government, just as the authorities of Massachusetts constitute another; yet they are not, properly speaking, two governments, but one government, as they work together, each supplying the deficiencies of the other, and both affecting the same individuals. Yet each part is fully organized, having its distinct departments, its separate executive, judicial and legislative bodies, and all the machinery of government complete.

Such a political system is not only anomalous; it is complex and intricate. At the first view, it seems open to grave objections; it is operose and artificial, lacking unity, and liable to be thrown into confusion by the clashing of the two parts of which it is composed. It is even difficult to be understood; English politicians, historians, and speculatists having but a very imperfect notion of it to this day. They seldom speak or write about it without falling into gross blunders, such as holding the national government responsible for the action of individual states, or one state for the action of another state. No political speculatist, no constitution-monger would have devised such a system, and recommended its adoption. Even the Abbé Sieyes, who had a new constitution for France in every pigeon-hole in his desk, and who succeeded in causing half a dozen of them to be put to the test of experiment—a test which was very quickly fatal to them—never imagined what he would have called

so fantastic a contrivance as the Constitution of the United States. Yet this complex and anomalous system works well. It has stood trial for two-thirds of a century, during which time the political storms, which have shattered most of the constitutions of Europe, have passed over it unharmed. Under its protection and guidance, the people have made greater progress in population and opulence than any other nation on earth. And if a check should ever be put to this extraordinary prosperity—if the Union, for instance, should fall asunder—the check must arise, so far as we can now see, from causes extrinsic to the Constitution, and not from any defects in the instrument itself, or from any dissatisfaction with it considered as a scheme of government. In other words, the practice of the government, not the theory of it, is the great evil we have to apprehend.

How came such an anomalous yet prosperous political system into being? This is the question which Mr. Curtis proposes to answer in the work now under review. To adopt his own language in the preface, he proposes to show "how the Constitution of the United States came to be formed; from what circumstances it arose; what its relations were to institutions previously existing in the country; what necessities it satisfied; and what was its adaptation to the situation of these states." Only half of the work is as yet published; but it affords ample evidence of the careful research, the rigid impartiality, and the sound scholarship with which the author is prosecuting his labours. He writes neither as a rhetorician nor a partisan; there are no unreasonable flights of eloquence, and no attempts to smuggle the political controversies of the nineteenth century into a grave history of what belongs only to the eighteenth. In conceiving the plan of his work, and devoting himself to its execution, Mr. Curtis had the countenance and encouragement of the great senator from Massachusetts, whose recent loss the whole country still deplores. To write a "History of the Constitution" was one of the favourite day-dreams of Mr. Webster's mind,—a dream which he abandoned only when the shadows of the dark valley had begun to thicken around him; and then, kindly, but solemnly, he made over the task to one of his young associates and disciples. The mention of these facts suggests rather a damaging comparison for Mr. Curtis; for one who opens his volume almost involuntarily asks himself: "How would Mr. Webster have written such a work?" But as this thought subsides in the interest of perusal, the reader will learn to do justice to the care, discretion, and ability, the soundness of opinion and uniform good taste with which the present undertaking has been executed.

Going back to the question first propounded—How came our

intricate and anomalous Constitution into being?—the answer readily suggests itself to every attentive student of the history of our revolutionary times. This answer is, that the Constitution naturally and necessarily grew out of the circumstances of the period in which it had its birth; it was moulded in all its important features by the grave exigencies of the case. The leading provisions of it could not have been different from what they are, without the whole project perishing in its inception; as either the people would have rejected it, or the great evils and perils which then weighed upon the nation with a paralyzing force, finding no check or remedy in an imperfect instrument and half-way measures, would have reduced the nation to disunion and anarchy. We do not mean, of course, that there was no merit on the part of those who fashioned the instrument, and secured its adoption. Hamilton, Madison, Jay, Morris, Pinckney, and King, were the ablest statesmen who have ever had the guidance of our ship of state, and a lasting debt of gratitude is due to their memory for the sagacity with which they discerned the exigencies of the times, and the wisdom with which they shaped their measures to meet those exigencies. Still the credit due to them rests not upon the ingenuity with which they devised such constitutional provisions as seemed to them best in the abstract, but upon the manliness and practical wisdom which they manifested in giving up their individual opinions and preferences, and submitting to be guided by circumstances. They adjusted the details only; causes were at work which shaped the main features of the instrument in spite of them. Strictly speaking, when the Constitution was completed, in its first draft, it fully satisfied nobody, either in the convention or out of it. "No man's ideas," said Hamilton, "were more remote from the plan than my own." At the close of the convention, Dr. Franklin said: "I consent to this Constitution because I expect no better, and because I am not satisfied that it is not the best. The opinions I have had of its errors I sacrifice to the public good." Six delegates refused to affix their signatures to the instrument. The convention itself, in its circular letter recommending the Constitution for adoption by the several states, spoke with singular diffidence and modesty of the result of its labours. "The Constitution which we now present," it remarked, "is the result of a spirit of amity, and of that mutual deference and concession which the peculiarity of our political situation rendered indispensable. That it will meet the full and entire approbation of every state is not perhaps to be expected;" but "that it is liable to as few exceptions as could reasonably have been expected we hope and believe."

Thus, though the Constitution of the United States is what has been reproachfully termed "a paper constitution,"—though it was devised and reduced to writing, as a whole, in one deliberative assembly convened for the purpose,—it still offers no exception to the general remark, that "constitutions are not *made*, but *grow* by an inherent law of progress and adaptation to changing circumstances." This is only another form of saying, that constitution-making, if successful, is not man's wisdom, but God's wisdom. When we say that the leading features of all successful and lasting systems of government are moulded by circumstances, and not by man's device, we mean that they are but a part of the grand scheme for the moral government of the world by its Creator. What is irresistibly controlled by events, is his ordinance, who ordereth all events for good. Any other view than this is paganism. It is in this sense that we interpret the noted remark of St. Paul, which has been so wofully perverted by the advocates of passive obedience: "For there is no power but of God; the powers that be are ordained of God. Whosoever, therefore, resisteth the power resisteth the ordinance of God."

According to this view, when we compare the different portions of the Constitution with each other, we may expect to find that those which have worked best, which have been most regular and beneficial in their operation, are precisely those which were forced upon the framers of the instrument by circumstances, and which they accepted, not of their own free will, but as necessary concessions and compromises; while those parts which have worked ill, or have become obsolete, were the choice inventions, the darling projects of those who had spent most time and thought upon the system. Take, as an instance of the former class, the equal representation of all the states in the Senate,—an arrangement which gives as much weight in legislation, in making treaties, and in appointing the subordinate officers of government, to Delaware, with less than one hundred thousand inhabitants, as to New-York, with more than three millions. Apparently, nothing could be more anomalous, unequal, or unjust; and nothing but the stern necessity of reconciling the conflicting claims of the larger and the smaller states could have induced the convention to propose such an article, or the people of the several states to accept it. The arrangement was literally forced upon us by circumstances; yet experience has proved it to be one of the most useful and beneficent features of the whole scheme. It has created no discontent; it has soothed state pride, and harmonized the mutual relations of the different members of the Union; it has supplied the necessary check upon sudden and

injurious fluctuations of popular opinion as manifested in the lower house; it has given stability and dignity to the legislative and administrative action of the government. If the Constitution were to be made over again, this feature in it would probably be reënacted by unanimous consent.

As an example of the latter class, take the mode of choosing the president—not directly, by popular vote, but through the medium of an electoral college—with the several contrivances to secure the purity and freedom of action of the electors. Theoretically considered, this is one of the wisest provisions in the Constitution. All abstract considerations are in favour of it; and it was adopted by the convention and the several states on its own merits, no pressing exigency of the time forcing such an arrangement upon the country against its own will. The strong arguments in its favour were thus ably set forth by Judge Story, in his excellent Commentaries on the Constitution:—

> "A small number of persons, selected by their fellow-citizens from the general mass for this special object, [of choosing the president,] would be most likely to possess the information, and discernment, and independence essential for the proper discharge of the duty. It is also highly important to afford as little opportunity as possible to tumult and disorder. These evils are not unlikely to occur in the election of a chief magistrate directly by the people, considering the strong excitements and interests which such an occasion may be naturally presumed to produce. The choice of a number of persons to form an intermediate body of electors would be far less apt to convulse the community with any extraordinary or violent movements, than the choice of one who was himself the final object of the public wishes. And as the electors chosen in each state are to assemble and vote in the state in which they are chosen, this detached and divided situation would expose them much less to heats and ferments, which might be communicated from them to the people, than if they were all convened at one time in one place. The same circumstances would naturally lessen the dangers of cabal, intrigue, and corruption; especially if Congress should, as they undoubtedly would, prescribe the same day for the choice of the electors, and for giving their votes, throughout the United States. The scheme, indeed, presents every reasonable guard against these fatal errors to republican governments."

But what is the lesson of experience respecting this provision, so unexceptionable in theory and so strongly commended by argument? Practically, this notable contrivance has been a dead letter ever since the formation of our government. It has produced no effects at all, for the very good reason that it has been practically nullified and blotted out of the Constitution. Every one knows that the form of voting for electors, instead of voting directly for a president, is a mere farce. The electors being irredeemably pledged beforehand to vote for a particular candidate, and this fact being universally known, every voter practically casts his ballot directly

for the man of his own choice to be chief magistrate. The electors do not pretend to deliberate or to choose; they are tied hand and foot by their previous engagements, and have no office to perform which might not be as well discharged by wooden automata as by human beings. The presence of the electors' names on the ticket which the voter casts into the ballot-box, is only an indirect mode of spelling the name of Clay or Polk, Taylor or Cass, Pierce or Scott. The electors are mythical personages to the voters, just as John Doe and Richard Roe are to the lawyers. The president is chosen directly by the people in spite of the Constitution; and not one of the predicted evils and abuses of this direct vote has actually happened.

According to the view now presented, the Constitution of the United States in all its important characteristics had its origin, not in human wisdom, but in the force of circumstances and the providence of God. This fact lends peculiar interest and value to the history of the circumstances which preceded and attended the formation and adoption of the instrument. Such a history offers the only materials for interpreting and judging the Constitution. The meaning of each article is best perceived in the exigency which led to it, and in the purpose which it was designed to accomplish. The general character of the whole instrument is best seen in the history of the circumstances which called it into being, and fashioned its leading provisions. The heresy of nullification, for instance, is not more fully confuted by the plain language of the Constitution, than by an exposition of the weakness, and the failure of the confederation, and the consequent determination of the statesmen of that epoch to substitute a government for a compact, and to consolidate the Union, instead of altering the terms of a league. Mr. Curtis's work is almost as much a commentary upon the Constitution as a history of it; or, rather, it is a commentary because it is a history.

We do not attempt to analyze the book, because no abstract of its contents could do justice to its merits. It is written in a grave and impartial tone, suited to the dignity of the theme, and it bears the marks of deliberate consideration and careful research throughout. Beginning with the outbreak of the Revolution, we have a plain and succinct account of the nature of the revolutionary government, which was at once established by universal consent, of the various attempts that were made to strengthen the central power, of the obstacles which impeded these efforts, and of the final establishment of the confederation. Here is a lucid explanation of the position of the colonies with respect to each other, when they first assumed an attitude of resistance to the authority of England.

> "The statements which have now been made are sufficient to remind the reader of the important fact, that, at the commencement of the Revolution, there existed, and had long existed, in all the colonies, local legislatures, one branch of which was composed of representatives chosen directly by the people, accustomed to the transaction of public business, and being, in fact, the real organs of the popular will. These bodies, by virtue of their relation to the people, were, in many instances, the bodies which took the initiatory steps for the organization of the first national or continental congress, when it became necessary for the colonies to unite in the common purpose of resistance to the mother country. But it should be again stated, before we attend to the steps thus taken, that the colonies had no direct political connexion with each other before the Revolution commenced, but that each was a distinct community, with its own separate political organization, and without any power of legislation for any but its own inhabitants: that, as political communities, and upon the principles of their organizations, they possessed no power of forming any union among themselves, for any purpose whatever, without the sanction of the crown or parliament of England. But the free and independent power of forming a union among themselves, for objects and purposes common to them all, which was denied to their colonial condition by the principles of the English constitution, was one of the chief powers asserted and developed by the Revolution; and they were enabled to effect this union, as a revolutionary right and measure, by the fortunate circumstance of their origin, which made the people of the different colonies, in several important senses, one people. They were, in the first place, chiefly the descendants of Englishmen, governed by the laws, inheriting the blood, and speaking the language of the people of England. As British subjects, they had enjoyed the right of dwelling in any of the colonies, without restraint, and of carrying on trade from one colony to another, under the regulation of the general laws of the empire, without restriction by colonial legislation. They had, moreover, common grievances to be redressed, and a common independence to establish, if redress could not be obtained: for although the precise grounds of dispute with the crown or the parliament of England had not always been the same in all the colonies, yet when the Revolution actually broke out, they all stood in the same attitude of resistance to the same oppressor, making common cause with each other, and resting upon certain great principles of liberty, which had been violated with regard to many of them, and with the further violation of which all were threatened."

The revolutionary union had its origin in the pressing necessities of the contest. Only in united means and united effort, in unity of command and a vigorous central power, was there any hope of resisting the arms of England. While the excitement of the original quarrel was fresh, and the patriotism of the people was high, before the states were exhausted by their efforts, or the alliance with France had given hope of external aid, a spontaneous and undefined union, and an extemporized central government, were enough. The revolutionary congress was an anomalous body, exercising anomalous functions. It had no constitution, no grant or limitation of its powers, beyond what it established for itself, and what it supposed the people and the states would tolerate. It had no authority but what it assumed. Urgent as the necessity was, for united and harmonious action, there is evidence enough, that the several states or groups of states, even at this epoch, were jealous of each other; and that

congress was obliged to temporize, and to humour the popular feeling which it could not control. In the notes to Mr. Curtis's volume are presented some curious passages from the secret history of those times, especially in relation to the appointment of a commander-in-chief, and the arrangement of measures leading to the Declaration of Independence. A great deal of the real work seems to have been done out of doors, in private consultation and agreement; the formal votes, in full session, sanctioned what had previously been arranged. In fact, as the congress had no power, and no occasion to enact laws, its functions were executive rather than legislative. It was not so much a deliberative assembly, as an executive council. It appointed general officers and ambassadors; it conducted diplomatic correspondence; it *recommended* certain measures to the states. Its sessions were secret, and there was little or no occasion for debate. Most of the work was done in committees, or through the agency of the president or the secretary of congress. We doubt if any measures excited much formal discussion, except the memorable one of declaring independence, and the perplexing task of arranging the articles of confederation. And the debate on either of these difficult and important themes could not have occupied more than a day or two. Private consultation among the members took the place of open discussion. We hardly need say, that a body could not have been more unfortunately constituted for executive purposes than this congress. Unity, energy, secrecy, and dispatch, are the most important qualities of a national administration; the revolutionary congress did not possess one of them, though it made an awkward attempt at secrecy, by holding its sessions in private. Fortunately, the members had sense enough to follow implicitly, as a general rule, the advice of the illustrious leader of their armies. They lent the weight of their authority to the recommendations of Washington; and, at the darkest period of the strife, as if from a sense of their own incompetency, they wisely gave him full dictatorial power.

For a while, however, as we have intimated, this anomalous and extemporized scheme of government worked tolerably well. The spirit of the people, the pressing exigencies of the hour, the wisdom of the commander-in-chief, supplied all defects. But when exhaustion, weariness, and gloom succeeded the first burst of enthusiasm and patriotism, the intrinsic evils of the system became manifest, and a change became inevitable. It was a dark hour to arrange the terms of a league, and to substitute an administration of legitimate authority, with well-defined powers and a regular organization, for the improvised executive council which had hitherto nominally held the reins of affairs. Unluckily, too, when the hour came to devise a

scheme of confederation, congress was no longer what it had been, at the opening of the contest, in respect to the zeal, ability, and influence of its members. The men were changed; as the authority and influence of the body had declined, the most eminent patriots had sought and found another sphere of action, in which they could be more serviceable to their country. Adams and Franklin had gone to Europe on public missions; Jefferson, Hancock, Rush, Hopkinson, Rutledge, and many others, had gone home to direct or inspect their respective state governments. Second rate men were delegated to fill their places; and even these felt so little interest in the exercise of their narrow and ill-defined powers, that with difficulty could a sufficient number of them be kept together for the transaction of business. All were not even honest; or, at any rate, they lacked wisdom to show their honesty. Cabal and intrigue began to appear among them, and to the pressure of public difficulties were added all the evils of personal jealousy and ambition. The machinations of Gates and Conway found more countenance and support in congress than in the army.

The articles of confederation, framed by such men and under such circumstances, were as wise and good as could reasonably have been anticipated. To some extent, they substituted system for disorder, a legitimate for an assumed authority, and strictly limited powers for vague experiments and feeble recommendations. The great mistake in framing them, appears to have arisen from the belief that it was enough to give form, precision, and legitimacy to powers already exercised by assumption, without materially enlarging the basis of the government, or adding to its means and authority; congress under the confederation could legally do about as much as congress had already done by general consent. The confederation was a formal league for general defence and protection; such a league had virtually existed by common assent, ever since the beginning of the contest. Under the new system, congress could determine how many men and how much money each state *ought* to raise; and under the old system, or want of system, it had done precisely the same thing. In neither case, had it any power to enforce its recommendations. In some respects, congress, under the confederation, was even weaker than its predecessor. The mode of voting was the same, each state having one vote. But in the revolutionary congress, any question that could be decided at all, could be decided by a bare majority of the states; while under the confederation, treaties or alliances could not be formed, money could not be borrowed or appropriated, bills of credit could not be emitted, the quotas of the several states could not be ascertained, and many other important

functions could not be exercised, except by the assent of nine states out of thirteen; frequently, two or more states being for the time not represented at all, the assent of nine out of ten or eleven was necessary. In fact, little could be done except by virtual unanimity; congress had no power of taxation, no control over commerce, no means of enforcing any of its measures upon a recusant state.

For a masterly account of the manner in which the defects of the confederation were developed by experience, and of the evils and exigencies which demonstrated the necessity of a more perfect union and a more efficient government, we refer our readers to Mr. Curtis's volume. For our own part, what seems most to need explanation in the history of those eventful times, is the strange reluctance of the states and the people to acknowledge the difficulties of their situation, and to accept the obvious remedy for them by creating a vigorous national government. Now that we have been living under the federal constitution for two-thirds of a century, and have experienced from it nothing but good, the country having been prosperous beyond all expectation, and our attachment to the memory of those who framed the instrument having risen to absolute veneration, it is difficult to go back to the period of its formation, to enter into the feelings and opinions of the men of those times, and to understand why they regarded with so much jealousy and dread the proposal of a more perfect union and the institution of an effective central government. To state the question plainly, Why did they need *to be whipped in* to the adoption of a measure, the good effects of which were almost instantaneous, and the expediency of which at this day does not seem to admit of a doubt? Perhaps Mr. Curtis might profitably have devoted an additional chapter to the answer to this question. It is hardly enough to say that the states were jealous of each other, because the confederation had made them rivals rather than friends, so that there had been a good deal of retaliatory legislation between them. Why should not this mutual jealousy and dislike have been allayed, rather than enhanced, by the prospect of a more perfect union, and the establishment of a central government to act as umpire between the contending parties? We can allude very briefly to but two circumstances which may assist us in resolving this problem.

First, the exertions and sacrifices of the states and the people during the war had been enormous, and a feeling of languor and exhaustion, an invincible disinclination to do or suffer anything more, had become well nigh universal. Industry had been unproductive, while the drafts of men and money had been fearfully great. Agriculture had been impeded, commerce had been destroyed, manufac-

tures were not yet in being. The paper currency having ceased to exist, because its value had fallen to nothing, the private debts, which had been contracted in this depreciated paper, had to be paid in gold or silver—that is, thirty or forty had to be paid for one. In looking back to those times, we remember that the government of the confederation was bankrupt and in distress, but we are apt to forget that the people were bankrupt and in distress also. The state legislatures were besieged with applications to pass tender laws, stop laws, appraisement laws, and a hundred other contrivances to relieve poor debtors; and many of the legislatures yielded to this pressure. An open rebellion broke out in Massachusetts, the sole object of which was to shut up the courts, to disable the constable and the sheriff, to hang the lawyers, and thus to render the collection of debts impossible.

Certainly it was right and just, that the claims of the army should be liquidated in full, that provision should be made to pay the interest, and gradually discharge the principal of the public debt, that payment of the debts due to British subjects before the war should be enforced, and that many other things should be done to maintain public faith and private credit. It was well understood that the immediate effect of the establishment of the new Constitution would be to enforce these claims and discharge these obligations. The exhausted and impoverished people, partially demoralized by the war, looked forward with dismay to the new burdens of taxation which would thus be placed upon their shoulders. They were well aware, also, that the new administration would enforce payment of private, as well as public debts; that the stern action of the federal judiciary would sweep away the whole fabric of tender and appraisement laws, would enforce the obligation of contracts, would prevent the states from issuing any more paper money, and thus, on every side, would increase their difficulties. They naturally shrank from a political change which would have such results. It is a humiliating but unquestionable fact, that the anti-federal feeling of those times derived much of its strength from the general desire for a repudiation of debts, and for public and private bankruptcy.

The second cause of aversion to the change was more honourable to the people, for it arose from an ill-directed and unenlightened attachment to liberty. They were fiercely impatient of anything which should seem to limit their newly acquired freedom. They had gone through all the dangers and sacrifices of the war to release themselves from a foreign yoke, and to secure the inestimable privilege of being taxed only by their own state legislatures. Were they now, of their own accord, to bend their necks to a new yoke, and

submit to be taxed, to be restrained in their commerce, to be deprived of half of their legislative power, to have the tribunals and the officers of a new-fangled government introduced among them? As well might they return to their former state of colonial vassalage. It mattered not, that the offices in the new administration were to be filled by men of their own choice; in the federal elections, the will of any one state would be overborne and beaten down by the united voice of the other twelve states. Each feared to find itself in the minority; each was apprehensive that it would be a vassal of the new government, rather than a member of it and a sharer in its privileges. In so far as the federal rule was a novelty, an untried experiment, it seemed foreign to the people. It was not a direct emanation from the state authority to which all were accustomed. It was a stranger in the land, coming to establish itself by the side of the dominion which all respected, and to rob it of half of its sovereignty. No wonder that many of the people resisted the change with as much earnestness as they had withstood British tyranny.

Again we must refer to Mr. Curtis's volume for a clear exposition of the causes, the pressing necessities and dangers, which finally overcame this reluctance, and established the new Constitution over the people almost in spite of themselves. We had proposed to say something of the character and labours of the eminent men to whom the formation and adoption of the new form of government are chiefly to be attributed; but our remarks have already occupied too much space, and we must close them with an extract, as a specimen of our author's manner, from his sketch of the character of Hamilton.

> "Hamilton's relation to the Constitution is peculiar. He had less direct agency in framing its chief provisions than many of the other principal persons who sat in the convention; and some of its provisions were not wholly acceptable to him when framed. But the history, which has been detailed in the previous chapters of this work, of the progress of federal ideas, and of the efforts to introduce and establish principles tending to consolidate the Union, has been largely occupied with the recital of his opinions, exertions, and prevalent influence. Beginning with the year 1780, when he was only three-and-twenty years of age, and when he sketched the outline of a national government strongly resembling the one which the Constitution long afterward established; passing through the term of his service in congress, when his admirable expositions of the revenue system, the commercial power, and the ratio of contribution, may justly be said to have saved the Union from dissolution; and coming down to the time when he did so much to bring about, first, the meeting at Annapolis, and then the general and final convention of all the states—the whole period is marked by his wisdom and filled with his power. He did more than any other public man of the time to lessen the force of state attachments, to create a national feeling, and to lead the public mind to a comprehension of the necessity for an efficient national sovereignty.

"Indeed, he was the first to perceive and to develop the idea of a real union of the people of the United States. To him, more than to any one else, is to be attributed the conviction that the people of the different states were competent to establish a general government by their own direct action; and that this mode of proceeding ought to be considered within the contemplation of the state legislatures, when they appointed delegates to a convention for the revision and amendment of the existing system.

"The age in which he lived, and the very extraordinary early maturity of his character, naturally remind us of that remarkable person who was two years his junior, and who became prime-minister of England at the age of twenty-four. The younger Pitt entered public life with almost every possible advantage. Inheriting "a great and celebrated name," educated expressly for the career of a statesman, and introduced into the House of Commons at a moment when power was just ready to drop into the hands of any man capable of wielding it, he had only to prove himself a brilliant and powerful debater, in order to become the ruler of an empire, whose constitution had been settled for ages, and was necessarily administered by the successful leaders of regular parties in its legislative body. That he was a most eminent parliamentary orator, a consummate tactician and leader of party, a minister of singular energy, and a statesman of a very high order of mind and character, at an age when most men are scarcely beginning to give proofs of what they may become,—all this History has deliberately and finally recorded. What place it may assign to him among the statesmen by whose lives and actions England and the world have been materially and permanently benefitted is not yet settled, and it is not to the present purpose to consider.

"The theatre in which Hamilton appeared, lived, and acted, was one of a character so totally different, that the comparison necessarily ends with the contrast which it immediately suggests. Like Pitt, indeed, he seems to have been born a statesman, and to have had no such youth as ordinarily precedes the manhood of the mind. But, in the American colonies, no political system of things existed that was fitted to train him for a career of usefulness and honor; and yet, when the years of his boyhood were hardly ended, he sprang forth into the troubled affairs of the time with the full stature of a matured and well-furnished statesman. He, in truth, showed himself to be already the man that was wanted. Everything was in an unsettled and anxious state;—a state of change and transition. There was no regular, efficient government. It was all but a state of civil war, and the more clear-sighted saw that this great disaster was coming. He was compelled, therefore, to mark out for himself, step by step, beginning in 1774, a system of political principles which should serve, not to administer existing institutions with wisdom and beneficence, but to create institutions able to unite a people divided into thirteen independent sovereignties; to give them the attitude and capacity of an independent nation; and then to carry them on, with constantly increasing prosperity and power, to their just place in the affairs of the world. It was a great work, but Mr. Hamilton was equal to it. He was by nature, by careful study, and by still more careful, anxious, and earnest thought, eminently fitted to detect and develop those resources of power and progress, which, in the dark condition of society that attends and follows an exhausting period of revolution, lie hidden, like generous seeds, until some strong hand disencumbers them of the soil with which they had been oppressed, and gives them opportunity to germinate and bear golden fruit. At the age of three-and-twenty he had already formed well-defined, profound, and comprehensive opinions on the situation and wants of these states. He had clearly discerned the practicability of forming a confederated government, and adapting it to their peculiar condition, resources, and exigencies. He had wrought out for himself a political system, far in advance of the conceptions of his contemporaries, and one which, in the hands of those who most opposed him in life, became, when he was laid in a prema-

ture grave, the basis on which this government was consolidated; on which, to the present day, it has been administered; and on which alone it can safely rest in that future which seems so to stretch out its unending glories before us.

"Mr. Hamilton, therefore, I conceive, proved himself early to be a statesman of greater talent and power than the celebrated English minister whose youthful success was in the eyes of the world so much more brilliant, and whose early death was no less disheartening; for none can doubt, that to build up a free and firm state out of a condition of political chaos, and to give it a government capable of developing the resources of its soil and people, and of insuring to it prosperity, power, and permanence, is a greater work than to administer with energy and success—even in periods of severe trial—the constitution of an empire whose principles and modes of action have been settled for centuries.

ART. III.—MR. MAURICE AND HIS WRITINGS.

1. *Theological Essays.* By FREDERICK DENISON MAURICE, M. A., Chaplain of Lincoln's Inn. Second Edition. With a new Preface, and other Additions. Cambridge, (England.) Macmillan and Co. 1853.
2. *The Unity of the New Testament: a Synopsis of the First Three Gospels, and of the Epistles of St. James, St. Jude, St. Peter, and St. Paul.* By FREDERICK DENISON MAURICE, M. A., Chaplain of Lincoln's Inn. London. John W. Parker and Son. 1854.
3. *Examination of Mr. Maurice's Theological Essays.* By ROBERT S. CANDLISH, D. D. London. Nesbit and Co. 1854.

THE first of the works on this list is the manifesto of Mr. Maurice's peculiar views, set forth systematically and pretty fully, and was the occasion of his dismissal from the professorship of divinity at King's College, London. The second has been subsequently published; but appears in substance to have been, for the most part, previously prepared, and contains no allusion, we believe, to the controversy and events which followed the publication of the "Essays." Our business in this article is primarily with the former work, and we shall only refer to the latter where it may afford peculiar illustration of views expressed or implied in the former. The third work on the list—Dr. Candlish's examination of Maurice's Essays—has been of some service in assisting us to form our judgment of the views propounded in those Essays.

No one at all acquainted with the previous writings of Mr. Maurice can doubt that the body of doctrines contained in the "Essays" had long been formed in his mind. Indeed, from his correspondence with Dr. Jelf it is certain, as we have seen in a former article, that for many years—even, as it would seem, from the period when he first emerged out of Unitarianism and took a deter-

mined position as a Trinitarian—he had held a system of opinions, partly negative and partly positive, identical in its main points and essential principles with that contained in these "Essays." The occasion, however, which led to the actual publication in a systematic and developed form of his theological system was peculiar and characteristic.

A lady, once a member of the Society of Friends, left by will a sum of money in charge of Mr. Maurice in order that he might be enabled "to write, or procure to be written, some book especially addressed to Unitarians." Of course the object of such a book would be to win Unitarians over to Trinitarianism. From the antecedents of Mr. Maurice it might be expected that such a task would have a special interest for him. The work to be accomplished, also, might seem all the less difficult in his case, inasmuch as he would not conceive that in winning them over to Trinitarianism it would also be needful to convert them to orthodoxy. He is himself as much opposed to evangelical orthodoxy as any Unitarian can be. He rejects as strongly as any follower of Priestley or of Belsham can have ever done the evangelical doctrine of atonement made by the blood of Christ. Though he feels no difficulty and sees no contradiction in the *natural* mystery of the Trinity, yet his heart refuses to accept the *moral* mystery of a guilty race and of atonement through the sufferings of a Divine Substitute; whereas the evangelical Christian receives in implicit faith both mysteries equally and alike on the supreme authority of the word of God. This, again, brings into view another and a fundamental point in regard to which Mr. Maurice would feel himself to be agreed with the Unitarian.

Though Mr. Maurice has changed the faith in which he was brought up, he has not abandoned the ground of Rationalism on which that faith rested, both as positively and negatively defined. He stands upon the same ground as the Unitarian in rejecting the faith of evangelical orthodoxy; he still stands, or supposes himself to stand upon the same in accepting the doctrine of the Trinity. According to his own statement, in his letter to a friend published in the correspondence with Dr. Jelf, it was on certain *à priori* grounds of reason, not on the authority of divine revelation, that he embraced the doctrine of the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost; so that Mr. Maurice and the Unitarian will not fundamentally disagree as to the method to be observed in theological controversy. An evangelical believer, when arguing with a Unitarian, finds it essential, in the first place, that the divine authority of the revelation contained in the Scriptures should be established; and then,

upon this basis, he rests his faith in all the doctrines of revelation. But, on this point, Mr. Maurice seems, on his own showing, to have never been anything different from a Unitarian. All, therefore, that *he* has to do, in arguing against Unitarianism, is to show that the Trinitarian doctrines—as apart from the evangelical doctrine of atonement—are accordant with the reason, consciousness, and necessities of man. If he can make this good, he has gained his point.

Certainly, as a supplementary buttress of the Christian faith, an argument making this good would, in some respects, be very valuable. So far as Mr. Maurice may have done this in any part of his volume he deserves the thanks of the Christian world. But it is important to observe that even if this were done to the conviction of all gainsayers, comparatively little might notwithstanding be effected. After all, the *mere* faith in a Trinity in Unity is not Christianity. A man who simply receives this abstract doctrine upon certain grounds of speculation and argument is very little more than a heathen philosopher. Apart from the humbling, yet exalting, doctrines of sin and grace, of guilt and atonement, there is no true Christianity. Even the doctrine of the Trinity loses its peculiar and transcendent glory when received apart from the relations of the Godhead—Father, Son, and Holy Ghost—to the recovery, sanctification, and final salvation of man; and the incarnation, apart from the atonement, becomes comparatively unimpressive, and, in many respects, altogether unintelligible.

We have already indicated that Mr. Maurice is, at bottom, a Rationalist. His "Essays" amply illustrate this. Throughout the volume he appeals, in evidence of the doctrines which he teaches. and in opposition to those which he denies, not in any case to the authority of Scripture, but always to human reason and consciousness. Scripture he occasionally uses in illustration of his views; but this he does very seldom, and he lets it be clearly seen that when he does, it is *only* by way of illustration, not of authentication. The structure of the work, however, is not at all argumentative, nor the texture of the "Essays" by any means logical. The "Essays" are throughout didactic. Mr. Maurice explains, teaches his system. He lays out his views in order, and exhibits their harmony with each other, and, as he conceives, with human consciousness. Sometimes, also, though never very formally, he endeavours to show how they agree with the teaching of Scripture. But he does not logically deduce them from any premises or principles laid down; far less does he derive them by any evident process from Scripture. That he merely expounds his views, however, and shows their rela-

tion to the common thoughts and feelings of humanity, does not make him the less a Rationalist. He contemptuously discards logic as his instrument, it is true, but still his appeal throughout is to consciousness, to the voice of man's spirit, and thus to the final verdict and judgment of man's reason, of which the logical faculty is but a form. "The question," as he says (in the Preface to his Second Edition) in reference to himself and certain opponents of the new Unitarian school,—"The question at issue between us is, not whether they are good reasoners and I am a bad one; but what gospel they have to bring to mankind, what light they have to throw on all the questionings and yearnings of the human spirit. On that issue I am willing to put their creed and mine."

It is no objection to this general view that many parts of these "Essays" seem to be vague and mystical in their teaching. As the present bishop of Hereford (Dr. Hampden) says somewhere in his Bampton Lectures: "Mysticism is but an insane Rationalism." Faith appeals to the word of God—leaving to reason the office of apprehending the evidence which attests the divinity of that word—and faith, so far as it is a religious faith, rests alone and implicitly on that word; whereas Rationalism, whether it be logical, intuitional, mystical, or to be described by any other epithet, relies not on the authority of God, but on the wisdom of men.

It has been matter of universal complaint that, though the *style* of the "Essays," as of all Mr. Maurice's writings, is exceedingly simple and purely English, yet the sense of many passages is extremely dubious, and the general purport of the volume, in a positive sense, almost impenetrably obscure. Its negative and destructive sense is generally plain enough. We soon find out that there are a great many things which Mr. Maurice strongly dislikes, and in general that he cordially detests and almost everywhere misrepresents the peculiar doctrines of evangelical orthodoxy. His sneers and sarcasms are, for the most part, plain enough. But what Mr. Maurice himself believes it is by no means so easy to make out. He does not deal in definitions; indeed these could scarcely be expected from a writer who repudiates logic. His descriptions about a thing and its relations are often eloquent; but all the while we have not been able to ascertain the precise nature of the thing itself. We may know what ideas we have been accustomed to associate with the name by which Mr. Maurice calls it; but Mr. Maurice has probably denied and denounced most of these, and given us to understand something very different from what we have been taught; yet he has never plainly told us what, in his judgment, it really is. He has perhaps told us where it is, when it is felt or

seen; he has also told us what, and where, and when, and how it is *not;* but all the while—our old notions being put to flight—we are only the more puzzled and perplexed as to what it is. One reason of this vagueness and obscurity in these "Essays" probably is that Mr. Maurice's faith is much more strongly defined negatively than positively. He knows what he dislikes and rejects, but has not clearly defined on some points what he actually accepts or admits. But the main reason is the real abstruseness of the principles of his Christianotyped philosophy. Some of his views are scarcely susceptible of popular statement. They require to be scientifically defined. But if thus defined, their scholastic abstruseness would repulse popular readers, while their lack of logical evidence would leave them powerless for the scientific thinker. A man can scarcely understand astronomy, even in general, without some systematic study of the elements of the science. So some logical and philosophical training is requisite if we would enter into the abstruse refinements of the Realistic philosophy. Now, strange to say, the doctrines of Platonic Realism lie at the bottom of all Mr. Maurice's vague speculations, and form the substratum of these discursive "Essays." For years past Mr. Maurice has been endeavouring to prepare the mind of Britain's earnest and intelligent youth to receive, in a popular form, these doctrines. But for such doctrines to be received with any degree of real intelligence and conscious mastery a different sort of preparation is needful. Even the genius of Mr. Maurice cannot put into popular form what is so essentially abstruse. Hence the "Essays" have come upon a public still unprepared to receive them. No doubt the destructive criticism (if anything so unmethodical may be called criticism) which they contain will do much harm—their sarcasms upon doctrines long esteemed venerable will unsettle some minds—but the positive system of speculative heresy, (as we do not scruple to call it,) which they are intended to teach, will find few prepared to apprehend, much less to receive it.

We have implied that Mr. Maurice is a Realist, and that a philosophy of Realism lies at the bottom of all his theology. Of course we have no intention here of entering into the depths of the scholastic controversy between the Nominalists and the Realists, which occupied the over-subtle intellects and sharpened the everlasting logic of the great schoolmen of the middle ages. Let none, however, imagine that these obsolete controversies have no present or permanent interest for us of this age. Dr. Hampden has made it abundantly evident, by his Bampton Lectures, that scholasticism was the forge in which the forms and phraseology of modern Church

doctrines were shaped. Realism, in particular, forms the ground upon which the Popish and Anglican high-Church doctrines of sacramental grace and efficacy are woven. Mr. Maurice's Realism, however, is not derived from the scholastic doctors of the middle ages, but from Plato. "Plato," says G. R. Lewes, in his Biographical History of Philosophy, "was the first Realist, Pierre Leroux is the last." He is, however, mistaken. Mr. Maurice is the latest Realist we know, and is a true inheritor of the spirit of the old pagan Platonism. This popular modern is endeavouring to introduce into the circles of English society in the present age the pre-Christian and anti-Christian ideal philosophy of Plato, well trained, however, to use modern phrases, to accommodate itself to modern prejudices and sentiments, and to speak with a pure English tongue.

We should despair of rendering Realism thoroughly intelligible, even in its general principles, to any one who has not been more or less trained in metaphysical habits of thought. We may say, however, briefly, that by this philosophy, what metaphysicians call an *objective reality* is assigned to the general notions of the mind. There is held to be an actual original corresponding to every abstract idea, by direct participation of which original any subject becomes invested with the attribute or quality denoted by such idea. Every distinct faculty and quality of human nature, for instance, as originally constituted, is supposed to have its separate archetype and original existing from eternity in the nature of Deity, by direct derivation from which it exists.

> "Thus all power, or wisdom, or goodness observed in the universe were actual derivations of qualities, intrinsically residing in God himself, and going forth as it were out of him into the works of his creation, not simply the *evidences* of the existence of such qualities in him as their Author and Giver; but the *real presence* of the divine qualities themselves analogically denoted by those terms. So again, the relations of human life, as that of Father and Son, were, according to their view, not original, as existing in human nature, but founded on their archetypes in God."—Dr. Hampden, (*Bampton Lectures*, Lect. iii, p. 109.)

This was the Realism of the schoolmen, but the description equally serves for the Realism of Plato, from whom undoubtedly this prime part of the scholastic philosophy, by means of which, as applied according to the logical and deductive *method* of Aristotle, such wonderful speculations were wrought out in the middle ages, was originally derived. That we have not erred in laying down this as a fundamental principle of Mr. Maurice's philosophy will be at once apparent from the quotations we are about to give. They occur in a sermon on the Creation, being the first in a volume of sermons on the Pentateuch, the first title of which is, "On the Old Testament."

Our readers will be puzzled by the passages as they read; but let them ponder them well. They will see that they make the Mosaic creation to have been a creation not of actual material things, but of the ideal archetypes of all things.

> "First of all 'God made man in his own image; male and female created he them;' *afterward* it is said he made '*a* man out of the dust of the ground, and breathed into *his* nostrils the breath of life.' If we follow the letter of these passages, and do not endeavour to put any notions of our own into them, we shall be led, I think, naturally to the conclusion that the former words have to do with the *species* as we should say, if we must have logical phrases, (which I would rather avoid if it were possible;) and that the other has to do with an *individual*—with the first man of the race. . . . . What I wish you particularly to notice is, that the part of the record which speaks of man ideally, according to his place with reference to the rest of the universe, according to his position with reference to God, is the part which expressly belongs to the history of CREATION; that the bringing forth of man in *this* sense is the work of the sixth day."—Pp. 3, 4.

* * * * * * * *

> "Extend this thought, which seems to rise inevitably out of the story of *man* as Moses delivers it, to the rest of that universe of which he regards man as the climax, and we are forced to the conclusion that in the one case, as in the other, it is not the visible material thing of which the historian is speaking—but that which lies below the visible material thing, and constitutes the substance which it shows forth. . . . . . . We are compelled, then, to consider creation of herbs and flowers as well as the creation of beasts and birds and fishes, which is recorded in the previous chapter [in chap. i] as the bringing forth of kind and orders such as they were according to the mind of God, not of actual separate phenomenal existences, such as they present themselves to the senses of man."—Pp. 5, 6.

Subsequently—but our space forbids us to quote more from this sermon—he teaches that the days and the week spoken of in Gen. i refer not to real, but ideal time. It is fit that the ideal creation (!) should take place in ideal time, which, of course, as indeed Mr. Maurice tells us, is no time at all.

Now this is pure Platonism, and Moses is thus made to speak Platonism to all men. Our readers will probably think it unintelligible; so, we must confess, do we: but it is Platonism notwithstanding. We do not wonder that an uninspired and heathen philosopher, matching his intellect, noble as it was, against the deep mysteries of being, and struggling in vain to solve them, should have invented speculations such as these. But we cannot but wonder at an English clergyman of the nineteenth century not only with the Bible in his hand, going back to Platonism, but positively finding his philosophy in his Bible.

But in what sphere have these invisible and impalpable "intelligibles" (as Plato used to call them) been resident? Some of the neo-Platonists held them to have had an independent subsistence from eternity; some even conceived of these abstract ideas as living

beings (!),* and as everlasting gods. Plato himself sometimes speaks of them as "eternal gods." Cudworth, however, Mosheim, and Maurice himself,† will not allow that Plato believed in anything so absurd as that these "intelligible ideas" had an independent existence. They were brought into being, and had their being, in the mind of the Deity. This mind of the Deity, the Divine Nous, is, moreover, so spoken of by Plato as to lead Cudworth and many before him, especially such as have themselves been inclined to Platonize, to conceive that Plato believed in a plurality of persons in the Divine Nature. Indeed it has been a not uncommon, though it may well be doubted if it is a just opinion, that he believed in something tantamount to a Christian Trinity,—The One or The Good, The Mind or Acting and Governing Reason, the Soul (Psyche), or Animating Principle, being the three hypostases of this Platonic Trinity, and the ideas of which we have spoken being undoubtedly connected by him especially with the Divine Nous, as their original, have been supposed to be, in the language of Cudworth, "all of them really nothing else but the noemata or conceptions of that one perfect intellect, which was the second hypothesis of the Platonists.‡ Now Mr. Maurice, undoubtedly, holds a correspondent view. Being a Platonist, he finds no difficulty in believing in what he calls a Trinity. With him the Son of God corresponds to the Divine Nous. In him all these preëxistent ideas are supposed to have been contained, and with him to have been identified. In particular, humanity is considered as having had its original in him, before all worlds. Mr. Maurice even speaks of all men as having been "created in him!" though, of course, this could not be except he were created. But in fact there seems to be no true idea of creation in the case. This philosophy is not one of creation, but of emanation. Nothing that exists is ever out of the Son of God, or separated from him. Hence Mr. Maurice uses, in the work from which we have been quoting, such language as the following:—

> "I ask you not to believe that a man was able to frustrate the purposes of God, not to think that the world was created in Adam, or stood in his obedience, when the Scriptures of the New Testament, illustrating those of the Old, teach us that it stood and stands in the obedience of God's well-beloved Son, the real image of the Father, the real bond of human society, and of the whole universe, who was to be manifested in the fulness of time, as that which he had ever been," &c.—Pp. 40, 41.

---

* Hence Butler, in Hudibras—"If *bonum* be an animal."

† Moral and Met. Philosophy. En., Metrop., New Ed., vol. i. pp. 146, 149. Throughout this work Maurice appears as the *advocate* of the Platonic philosophy.

‡ Intellectual System, ii, 350. Tegg's edition, with Mosheim's erudite and invaluable notes, translated by Harrison. London.

Hence also the Son of God is spoken of as "He in whom God formed all men to be brethren, so that he who sheds the blood of another, sheds his own," as "he from whom came the life, the faith, the hope, the love of all who had strength to believe that God was their Creator, and Preserver, and Deliverer," "in whom God could look upon them, and they could look upon God."—Pp. 58, 59. But many more and much more remarkable passages in the same sense will be found in his latest works, and a few of these we shall give by and by. One more quotation from the same volume we give here, the meaning of which some deeper Platonist than ourselves must give.

> "Do not be frightened by the word anthropomorphism, for there may be the deepest reason in the nature of things, in the laws of the universe, why God should only be known in and through a man."—Pp. 73, 74.

What we have now said will help our readers to understand our meaning when we say that the fundamental principle of Mr. Maurice's speculations in his two famous "Essays," is that all men are, by a real physical identity, one with the Son of God. The original of human nature, by direct participation of which all men are men, has from eternity been with and in the Son of God. Obscure hints of this doctrine had been given in some of Mr. Maurice's former works, especially, as we have seen, in some passages of his volume "On the Old Testament." But the "Essays" show how it is related to his whole scheme of speculation. It is not indeed explicitly assumed, or definitely stated, in any part of the "Essays;" but it underlies the whole and gives shape to every part. It is perpetually coming out in such expressions as, that the Son of God is "the root and ground of our humanity." Perhaps nowhere in the compass of one or two sentences is it so clearly implied as when Mr. Maurice says of St. Paul, on his receiving baptism:—

> "How impossible, then, was it for him to receive baptism as if it were merely the outward badge of a profession, a sign which separated the sect of the Nazarenes from other Jews or other men! If it marked him out as a Christian, that was because it denoted that *he would no more be the member of any sect, of any partial society whatever, and that he was claiming his relation to the Son of God, the Head of the whole human race.* It must import his belief that THIS SON OF GOD AND NOT ADAM, WAS THE TRUE ROOT OF HUMANITY; THAT *from him*, AND NOT FROM ANY ANCESTORS, EACH MAN DERIVED HIS LIFE."—P. 202.

So he says, (p. 94,) "*In him* (the Son of God) and for him *we were created.*" To learn, however, the full force of such language as this, when used by Mr. Maurice, it will be necessary to trace the influence of the principle we have stated upon the whole tissue of his speculations. No isolated sentence or statement will fully express

even its own meaning. There is generally more or less ambiguity in the mere words, which only an attentive consideration of the whole scope and context can altogether remove. We do not presume to say how far this ambiguity is designed; but it characterizes most of the volume. The ordinary reader feels himself to be in a perpetual maze of uncertainty, as if he could scarcely ever fix Mr. Maurice's sense or get at the bottom of his purpose. Only the initiated can see the principle and plan which consistently pervade the volume. In Mr. Maurice's later work, however, on the "Unity of the New Testament," he speaks occasionally more plainly if not more boldly. Perhaps there is less reason since his separation from King's College, why he should in any way veil his meaning. The whole of Mr. Maurice's general exposition of the Epistle to the Ephesians, in this volume, is full of the principle we have laid down. We shall have occasion hereafter to quote from this exposition some passages illustrative of the effect of this principle of Mr. Maurice on his general scheme of doctrine. Meanwhile the following brief but pregnant extracts will throw light upon our present point:—

> "Here, [in the epistle to the Ephesians,] if anywhere, we may expect to find the ground of a spiritual society which has a deeper foundation than the Jewish calling or covenant, which has its foundation in the nature of God himself, which explains and supports all human relationships, which has all spiritual enemies to fight with set forth," &c.—*Unity of the N. T.*, p. 516.
>
> "What St. Paul asserts on behalf of himself and the little band of those who had turned to God and believed in Christ, was a share in the privileges of humanity as that is created, elected, known by God in Christ."—P. 526.
>
> "It had been shown him [Paul] that the Gentiles *are* [not *should be*, according to our version] fellow-heirs and of the same body. *Beginning from that highest ground before the fall, before the creation, he had seen God creating all things in Christ,* God purposing to gather up all things in Christ, *men standing only in virtue of God's election of them in Christ.* So the truth dawned upon him that all men, of whatever race or tongue, do constitute one body in him; that out of him, whether circumcised or uncircumcised, they must be divided; since *in him, whether circumcised or uncircumcised, they are one,* BY THE LAW OF THEIR CREATION, and become actually one, when they believe *that law*, and submit to it. Here was the foundation of a gospel, *the gospel with which St. Paul was intrusted;* good news to men, not of something which was coming to them, *but of their actual state, of that state which belongs to them, but which they do not recognize.*"—Pp. 536, 537.

So, in his analysis of the Epistle to the Romans, especially of the fifth, sixth, and seventh chapters, the same principle underlies the whole.

> "I look," says Mr. Maurice, "upon Christ's death and resurrection as revelations of the Son of God in whom all things had stood from the first, in whom God had looked upon his creature man from the first."—P. 367.

Elsewhere, in the same work, when giving his view of the general purport of Matthew xxiv and xxv, Mr. Maurice says:—

> "If we do believe that the Son of man is himself best able to tell us what sitting on the throne of his glory and the gathering before him of all nations are, let us listen to his own teaching; let us think that *when he utters the words, 'Inasmuch as ye did it to one of the least of these ye did it to me,' he proclaimed that which is the very truth of human existence*, that with which it must be eternal life to be in conformity, and eternal death to be at variance. *He actually is one with every man.* He has come to proclaim that he is by his incarnation and his death. He did judge the old world according to this law."—Pp. 219, 220.

So again, speaking of the connexion between the passover and the eucharist, he teaches that—

> "Beneath the Jewish kingdom there did actually lie another and a deeper one; its national sacraments contain the idea of some more real sacrament grounded upon *an actual relationship between the Son of God and* [*not, be it observed, believers, but*] *human creatures, of the most intimate kind which language can express, a relationship implying the closest communion of inward life, of inward love.*"—Pp. 146, 147.

And here, to end these quotations, is a remarkable bit of Platonic Realism, directly bearing upon our present point. Mr. Maurice is commenting on the text, "In heaven their angels, &c.," in the eighteenth chapter of St. Matthew, and observes:—

> "The little child, the humblest human creature, was dear to his Father in heaven. He did not look upon it merely as a fallen corrupted thing. *Its angel, its pure original type, that which it was created to be, was ever present with him, was ever looking up into his face.* To bring it to this state was his will."—Pp. 205, 206.

This, viewed by the light of the other passages we have cited, and connected with the scope of the whole volume, can only mean that every separate child, or human creature, had from eternity its archetype and original; that all these archetypes meet in and are identified with the Son of God; that in him they all—all these "angels"—are ever present with the Father, ever looking up into his face! Our readers will now perceive with what justice we identified the teachings of Mr. Maurice, notwithstanding his popular and somewhat fashionable air, with the abstrusities of a Platonic Realism.

We have been thus particular in establishing our fundamental position, partly because it wore a strong *primâ facie* appearance of improbability when held in regard to a writer so opposed in style and method to anything like philosophical abstruseness as Mr. Maurice; partly also because, so far as we know, none of Mr. Maurice's many critics hitherto has appeared to be aware of his Realism and Platonism, and it might be imagined, therefore, that we could have no sufficient ground for our assertions; and partly, again, because, this position once established, the work of anything like fundamental refutation of speculations resting on such a basis

is, as we conceive, rendered superfluous. There may still remain to be corrected misrepresentations of that evangelical doctrine which Mr. Maurice, of necessity, rejects; but the main work needful to dispose of Mr. Maurice's speculations will be to show how all these logically flow from the one principle we have explained; we say logically flow, for though Mr. Maurice eschews logic as an instrument of conviction or as giving method to exposition, we must do him the justice to say that there is a real and close logical connexion between all the parts of his theory. Mr. Maurice no doubt has acted wisely in avoiding a logical exposition of his views. To have done this would have compelled him to define, in bare matter-of-fact terms, the fundamental principle on which the whole of his speculations rests. But we imagine that this would at once have been fatal to his cause, since the modern public are hardly likely to concede so unaxiomatic a postulate as the truth of Platonic Realism.

It will at once be seen how incompatible such a principle as that which has been explained is with the whole tenor of orthodox Christian theology. It displaces or essentially alters every peculiar doctrine of Scripture. The first and most obvious effect is, that the relation of the Father to the human race is altered. It is no longer even that of a creator—properly or precisely understood—unless indeed the Son were created, or the human nature of Christ, as one with the Son, were created anterior to the formation of Adam, one of which suppositions would really seem to be required by several of the expressions we have quoted.* It is not by any means that of a sovereign ruler—it is merely that of a Father. The analogy of providential rule is no longer that of a general government under law, according to the will and mind of the ruler, and for the common weal. It is that of a family under the eye of a father. Nay, the relation between human creatures and the Father of our Lord Jesus Christ becomes, on this hypothesis, even dearer, more intimate, and more unchangeable than this analogy might seem to imply. All men are essentially and always bound to the great Father in the unity of his infinitely worthy, endeared, and glorious Son. None of them possesses a separate and merely individual relationship to the Father. The being of all is one with the being of the One. None can be finally disinherited, because none can for a moment be severed from that One. The Son of God is and ever must be in and one with every man. This, as we

---

* For example: "In Him we were created." "Humanity is created, elected, known, by God in Christ." "Before the creation God created all things in Christ." So also at p. 204 of the Essays it is said of all men, as men, that "they are created, redeemed, justified in Christ."

shall by and by see, is not only a corollary from the fundamental principle of Mr. Maurice's theory—it is the express, reiterated, uniform doctrine of the "Essays." Law and justice, as the oracle and arm of the Divine Governor, are thus done away; love only remains. There may be disapprobation of acts, but never condemnation of the person. There will, therefore, be no great assize—no judgment-day. And if there be no general judgment, there can be no general resurrection either. So Mr. Maurice teaches; so, on his principle, he *must* teach. We may particularly refer to Essays II, IV, V, and XII, on "Sin," "The Sense of Righteousness in Man, and their Discovery of a Redeemer," "The Son of God," and the "Judgment Day," in proof and illustration of the representation we have now given. Of course the doctrine of the atonement vanishes on this theory. Mankind have never been far off, and therefore have no need to be brought nigh. All they need, as Mr. Maurice constantly teaches, is to see how near they *are* and ever have been. Neither could the Son of God become, by special covenant, the substitute for those with whom he is by nature and from eternity physically identified,—in the strictest and most intimate sense, already one. "Christ is actually the Lord of men, the king of their spirits, the source of all the light which ever visited them, the person for whom all nations longed as their Head and Deliverer, *the root of righteousness in each man.* The Bible speaks of his being revealed in this character; of the mystery which had been hid from ages and generations being made known by his incarnation. *If we speak of Christ as taking upon himself the sins of men by some artificial substitution, we deny that he is their actual representative.*"—Essays, p. 144. Indeed, not only the evangelical doctrine of atonement by the vicarious sufferings and death of Christ is done away, but no part of the Scriptural doctrine of Christ's mediatorship remains. Mr. Maurice does, indeed, regard and speak of the Son of God as mediator. But this is not in consequence of the covenant of grace. In his view, the mediatorship is not grounded upon the incarnation, but the incarnation is the manifestation in time and on the earth of that mediatorship which had existed before creation and before time. The Son of God has ever been the mediator between God and man, in virtue of his original relationship to both. This mystery, in the language of our last quotation, "was hid from ages and from generations, but was made known by the incarnation." See Essays V, VI, and VII, on "The Son of God," "The Incarnation," and "The Atonement."

Of course this relationship is not affected by what we call the fall of man. Had Adam never fallen, Christ would still have been me-

diator, in the same sense that he is now, and would equally have become incarnate. A careful reader will find that this is assumed throughout the "Essays." In the "Unity of the New Testament" it is very clearly implied, though we do not find it anywhere, in so many words, affirmed.

We may, however, particularly refer to the former part of the analysis of the Epistle to the Romans, and to the general tenor of that of the Epistle to the Ephesians. Mr. Maurice strongly and altogether rejects the view that "St. Paul's theology starts from the idea of human depravity; that he looks upon Christ and all the acts of Christ, [he, Mr. Maurice, is almost afraid of using profane language, but knows not how to avoid it,] as mere provisions against sin." Of course we do not regard the mediatorial arrangements as *mere* provisions against sin; but Mr. Maurice intends to deny that they were, in any sense, expressly adapted to meet the conditions and needs of a fallen world. Indeed, according to him, fall, in our sense, there has been none. There have been sins and evils; and these have, in many instances, and often for long periods of time, accumulated from age to age. There is also an evil spirit whose temptations have been the occasions of sin, and who has ever been prompt to take advantage of circumstances in planning and pressing his temptations. But, notwithstanding all this, righteousness has ever been more native and essential to man than sin. The Son of God has ever been in and with those whom he created in his own image; more intimately near to them, and more truly and vitally one with them, than the spirit of evil, however the evil spirit might, for a time, seem to triumph over them. This is the doctrine expressly taught by Mr. Maurice in two remarkable essays,—those on "The Sense of Righteousness in Man, and his Discovery of a Redeemer," and in "The Evil Spirit." (IV and III.) The former of these essays has been felt to be particularly obscure; we have not met with any of Mr. Maurice's critics who seemed to understand it; but the key we have given will be found to unlock its meaning.

Mr. Maurice's doctrine as to justification and regeneration, (Essays IX and X,) will, of course, correspond with his views on the subject of the mediation and the atonement. The justification of Christ by the resurrection was, precisely and literally, the justification of all men. "God having justified his Son by raising him from the dead, *in that act* justified the race for which Christ died," (Essays, p. 202,) Christ being "the *actual* mediator between God and man. His resurrection declared that God *confessed* him in that character, and thereby *confessed men to be righteous in him*," (Ibid., p. 203;) so that "it must be the right and duty of men at all times to turn to

him in whom they ARE *created, redeemed, justified.*"—P. 204. "St. Paul," we are told, "takes it for granted that this justification of the Son of God and the Son of man was his own justification—his own, because *he was a man;*" he "was assured that his justification was the justification of *each man.*"—P. 201. And as all men are thus *justified*, collectively, in Christ, so humanity also derives from the incarnation of the Son of God a collective *regeneration.* The manifestation in the flesh of the Son of God, the root, and head, and exemplar of humanity, dates a new era for the race, and becomes the spring of new and mighty influences. "The Son of man . . . . has come to claim men as spiritual beings, capable of this spiritual life, inheritors of this spiritual kingdom. Baptism declares this to be their proper and divine constitution in Christ. All who receive it, claim the kingdom which God has declared to be theirs. *They take up their rights as spiritual beings.* He bestows his Spirit upon them, that they may enjoy these rights." . . . . "The light of God's countenance *is shining* upon them; the Spirit is with them to open their eyes, that they may take in the light of it."—*Essays*, pp. 229, 230. So we read of "the Church's faith in its divine birth, in its *regenerate position*, in God's calling," (p. 242,) and that "God has regenerated the world in Christ."—P. 244.

This being the state of the case, there being for men "this righteousness, a righteousness for them one and all, not as separate creatures, but as members of a body," (Unity, &c., p. 543,) all distinctions between justified and unjustified—regenerate and unregenerate—men are done away. Only some may recognise what others as yet are not aware of. "The gospel with which St. Paul was intrusted was good news to men, not of something which was coming to them, but of their actual state—of that state which belongs to them, but which they do not recognize." "The danger lay in their thinking that they were to create a state for themselves, instead of accepting one and abiding in it." "All the exhortations which follow to the very end of the Epistle [to the Ephesians,] assume as their groundwork, that the true state of man, and, consequently, *their* state, is now revealed in Christ; that a divine illumination was all about them and within them; and that if they did not live in it, if their lives were not clear and orderly, it was because they were shutting their eyes."—*Unity*, &c., pp. 536, 537, 540, 541. It follows from this, that there is no Church distinct from the world; no Spirit given to the Church, as he is not to the world; no inspiration of one class of men, distinct in kind from that granted to others, and, in some sense and degree, granted to all. So Mr. Maurice teaches, though his meaning is often involved in a strange mist, in the Essays on the

"Unity of the Church," on the "Holy Spirit," and on "Inspiration." (XV, XIV, XIII.)

We have seen that Christ's death, on Mr. Maurice's theory, was no atonement for guilt, no price of redemption, in no sense the meritorious and procuring cause of life for the world. It was but a noble and holy example; the last and crowning act of a life of self-sacrifice. We have seen, moreover, that the mediatorial dignity and glory of Christ are not to be considered in any respect as the reward of his "obedience unto death, even the death of the cross;" but as appertaining to him, because of his aboriginal and (we might almost say) natural relationship, before all worlds, both to God and to man. "The glorious ascension" of Christ to the right hand of the Father, loses, therefore, on this hypothesis, all its peculiar significance. It is no installation into office and dignity won by suffering and death; it is no assumption of royalty over a purchased people; no declaration of victory and dominion over the vanquished power of hell; it is no longer a glorious enthronization, which looks back to Bethlehem and Calvary, and forward to the final day of judgment; it is not to be dated in heaven and in earth as the commencement of a reign of surpassing glory, during which Jesus, the Son of God, is to bring to a full accomplishment all the divine purposes in regard to the race of man on earth; until, the last enemy having been destroyed, and the number of the elect being complete, he shall, as the closing act of his mediatorial royalty, gather all nations and ages into one concourse, to pronounce for every soul its final award, and then, delivering up the kingdom to God, even the Father, shall himself become subject unto him who had put all things under him, that God may be all in all.

We say, on Mr. Maurice's theory, the ascension of Christ is no longer related to any such dominion or glory as we have been trying with stammering lips to describe. We cannot wonder then, that, as Dr. Candlish shows, Mr. Maurice reduces and degrades this ascension to a mere passage from a visible to an invisible condition.

The ascended Christ means Christ removed from the conditions of sense and time. His throne is in men's hearts, but not in any local heaven. He descends as Judge continually into the thoughts and spirits of men, but will never be seen, in the presence of all worlds, and at the consummation of all things, as the universal Judge, nor thus appear to his saints the second time, without sin, unto salvation. In perfect accordance with all this, and with his whole theory, heaven and hell, as separate places of abode, are discarded by Mr. Maurice. Christ and his saints, Satan and his angels, may be any-

where and everywhere: they may be continually intermingled with each other, and both may, at this or any moment, be mingling on earth with men. Thus is Christ invisibly, yet really and *corporeally* present, Mr. Maurice would have us believe, at the eucharist; and thus the doctrine of the real presence is met without any approach to transubstantiation. See Essays VIII, XI, and XII, on "The Resurrection of the Son of God, from Death, the Grave, and Hell," on "The Ascension of Christ," and on "The Judgment-day."

We have said that Christ is invisibly, but corporeally present. This naturally leads us to speak of another of Mr. Maurice's peculiar notions. As there will be no general judgment, there will, of course, be no general resurrection. We cannot imagine an appointed period for the dead to rise again with their bodies, unless this is in order to judgment. Mr. Maurice, accordingly, does not believe that our bodies—that is, what other people call bodies—the flesh and blood we wear—will ever rise again.

According to him, our death is our resurrection—the last trump is the last warning of coming death—"the moment, the twinkling of an eye," is the instant when the spirit parts from the flesh. When our spirits pass, they go forth in refined vehicles, with and in which they shall live forever, and which Mr. Maurice chooses to call our "body." *Thus* our bodies rise. This "flesh and blood," this "corruption," this "disgraceful" appendage to our proper selves, which is laid in the grave, will never, under any form, nor will any equivalent for it, rise again. Mr. Maurice tells us that *this* has been added to us for our sins; see pp. 160, 169, of the "Essays;" though, how this should be, in a world which he will not allow to be, in any proper sense, fallen, we cannot understand. From this theory it must follow that the body in which our Saviour rose from the grave was not the very flesh and blood with which his disciples had been familiar. So startling a consequence, Mr. Maurice, indeed, does not state; but this *must* be his real and secret doctrine. It agrees well with all the negative indications of the Essays in the matter of our Lord's resurrection; and it also agrees, as we think, with the following extract from the work on the "Unity of the New Testament." We must premise that Mr. Maurice very explicitly makes in the Essays that distinction between what *he* calls the body and this corruptible flesh and blood, which we have stated above, and that in quoting the sixteenth psalm as a prophecy relating to our Lord, he reads, "neither his *body* [not *flesh*] did see corruption." See pp. 160, 169, 180. The passage from the "Unity, &c.," to which we have referred, is as follows: "The sense of a body," [the body of our Lord, considered as the type and exemplar of the human body in general,] "delivered

from the chains of death, essentially the same as it was before, using naturally, as its own, powers which had been hidden, or had only occasionally come forth, is one part, not the only, or perhaps the chief part, of the revelation. Its capacity of vanishing and of reappearing is felt to indicate the possibility of a spiritual presence, which may be continually near, and in which men may be meant ever to abide."—Pp. 301, 302. See on the subject of this paragraph, the Essays last referred to—VIII, XI, and XII.*

As to the doctrine of the Trinity in Unity, Mr. Maurice believes in it, much as it appears to us, as a Neo-Platonist might have done, apart from all faith in the *evangelical* relations and offices of the three persons. Hence he can afford to postpone his Essay on this subject (No. XVI—and in the first edition, the last) to the very close of the volume.

The concluding Essay, with reference to the teaching of which Mr. Maurice was dismissed from King's College, is an expansion of what was the last part of the sixteenth Essay. The subject is "Eternal Life and Eternal Death." Of course Mr. Maurice cannot believe in the final and judicial punishment of any. This Essay, accordingly, is an attempt to separate from eternal death, as spoken of in Scripture—and if from this, also from eternal life—the idea of finality and everlastingness.

The moral basis of all this theological scheme, Mr. Maurice attempts, as might be expected, to establish in the divine "charity." "Charity," accordingly, is the title of the first Essay. But the charity of which he speaks is not merely an attribute, the nature of which he does not define, but one in regard to the true idea and character of which he says, plainly, he does not think it needful to raise a point with any one, whether infidel or believer. A vaguer, weaker, more unsatisfactory essay than this first we never read. Of course, the argumentative worth of that which argues nothing, and attempts to define nothing, cannot be much. Evangelical divines also would found any theological scheme they might lay down upon the moral basis of the divine "charity," or love; but then, they would take care to define what is to be understood by this.

In a necessarily restricted article like the present, it is impossible for us to give a fuller outline than we have now done of the scope

---

* There is nothing against which Mr. Maurice more frequently speaks in his Essays than against Gnosticism and Pantheism, except, indeed, evangelical orthodoxy. Yet those who are acquainted with the characteristics of Gnosticism will at once recognise in such views as are referred to above, some curious points of coincidence with that early heresy; and as to Pantheism—his doctrine of the identity of all men with the Son of God is a manifest approximation to Pantheism.

and contents of Mr. Maurice's volume, or to attempt to establish and illustrate the correctness of the outline we have given by adequate quotations. But those who have the "Essays" will easily test the accuracy of our representations; and, indeed, the general scope of Mr. Maurice's doctrinal innovations is by this time so well known, that intelligent and well-informed persons will be able to judge, in general, of the consistency and probability of the view we have given. We shall proceed now to notice more particularly a few selected points.

We have said that, on Mr. Maurice's theory, God does not appear characteristically or properly as the Creator, or the Lawgiver and Ruler of men, but merely as their Father—their Father, not by grace, but by nature—and the Father equally of all, inasmuch as all are equally identified with the Son of God. In illustration of this, we shall proceed to quote some passages from Mr. Maurice's second Essay on "Sin." Here Mr. Maurice first misrepresents—distorts, we must say—and brands with harsh words, and biting sneers, the common theological view of sin, as an offence committed against the law of God, which God is bound to visit with punishment, (pp. 19–21,) and then he proceeds to give us his own impressions upon the subject. We wish we could give the whole of the passage in which he does this; it possesses much eloquence, much plausibility, and some truth, though it *seems* to be often more truthful than, taking Mr. Maurice as his own interpreter, we are at liberty to believe it really is, and the impression it produces would be very much weakened, if Mr. Maurice had not, according to a common device of "new lights," used orthodox language, such as finds an echo in every sinner's breast, to convey his own unorthodox sense.

But our limits force us to compress, and to quote nothing but what is essential. When Mr. Maurice says that, at some moment, the sinner "may be forced to feel, 'I did this act, I thought this thought; it was a wrong act, it was a wrong thought, and it was *mine*;'" he of course expresses a truth of which every man is conscious, but throws upon this truth no light of his own. When he says, that, "at such a moment, there will come a sense of eternity, dark, unfathomable, hopeless," we must remember that by eternity Mr. Maurice, as he explains in his last essay, very particularly understands something out of and above sense and this world, but with which no idea of everlastingness, or of duration, in any sense or degree, is associated. When he tells us, that, to the awakened sinner, "anything is better than the presence of this dark self," and that "to be dogged by that night and day" is "torture and death," we must remember, that, a few pages further on, (p. 29,) he defines the "sense of sin"

as "essentially the sense of solitude, isolation, distinct, individual responsibility."

When we read, that the sinner having thus "arrived at the conviction, 'I am the tormentor—evil lies not in some accidents, but in me,' is no more in the circle of outward acts, outward rules, outward punishments"—we are to understand the plain sense to be, that the convinced sinner has no sense of an outward objective law, the law of God, which he has violated, and that he has no apprehension of any outward punishment for the violation of that law. He is in "a more inward circle—a very close, narrow, dismal one,"—that is, he is shut up to and in himself; he has a dark sense of solitude, isolation, distinct, individual responsibility," as to what he shall become, what he shall make of himself, whether he shall be lonely, or at large, selfish or loving, by and for himself, or one with God and with his fellows. Out of this circle, Mr. Maurice tells us, "he can only emerge, when he begins to say, 'I have sinned against some Being—not against society merely, not against my own nature merely, but against another, to whom I was bound.' And the emancipation will not be complete, till he is able to say—giving the words their full and natural meaning—'FATHER, I have sinned against *thee*."—Pp. 22, 23.

> "Think of any sermon of a Methodist preacher, which roused the heart of a Kingswood collier, or of a dry, hard, formal man, or of a contented, self-righteous boaster of his religion, in the last century. You will say the orator talked of an infinite punishment, which God might inflict on them all, if they continued disobedient. He may have talked of that, but he would have talked till doomsday, if he had not spoken another language too, which interpreted this, and into which the conscience rapidly translated it. He spoke of an infinite *sin;* he spoke of an infinite *love;* he spoke of that which was true then, whatever might become true hereafter. He said, 'Thou art in a wrong state; hell is about thee. God would bring thee into a right state: he would save thee out of that hell.' The man believed the words; something within him told him they were true; and that for the first time he had heard truth, seen truth, been himself true. I cannot tell what vanities and confessions might come to him afterward, from his own dreams or the crudities of his teachers."—Pp. 26, 27.

This, then, was the secret of the amazing power and success of the early Methodist preachers! No single objective truth of Christ's gospel had anything to do with it. It was not the preaching of the law which was the means of awakening sinners; it was not the proclamation of salvation through the ransom price of Christ's blood, which brought these awakened sinners to faith and pardon. These things were but the "crudities" of the Methodist "teachers." No, it was the mere abstract truth that God is love. Love without law, pardon without satisfaction to holiness—this is the gospel which, Mr. Maurice says, roused the hearts of colliers, and of formalists and

Pharisees, whether dry and hard, or contented boasters. Does Mr. Maurice really know anything of the history of Methodism, that he thus speaks? or, can a man who knows anything of human nature believe that thus to exhibit the supreme Ruler, as a "mere image of good nature," will either awe or win any, whether publicans or Pharisees, to repentance and righteousness?

Throughout this essay, God is represented only as a Father. He is called by no other name but God and Father, "the Father of a family," (p. 29,) "a Father, actually related to us," to all alike, "by the closest, most intimate bonds,". (p. 31.) This is what we were prepared to expect. The Scriptures, however, while they represent him as the Father of all who believe in Christ, represent him also as "the righteous Judge," "the Judge of all the earth," as him who is "just, and the justifier of him who believeth in Jesus," as the "Holy One," as "glorious in holiness."

If Mr. Maurice holds such views as to the nature of sin, it will, of course, be anticipated that he is quite as remote from evangelical orthodoxy on the subject of depravity. He does, indeed, admit that there is a universal prevalence of sin, that there is in all men "pravity as a fact;" nay, having subscribed the thirty-nine articles, he does not hesitate to employ in his own sense the phrase "infection of nature," and to admit that this belongs to all men. But yet he denies *depravity of nature*, in any sense; he will not allow a con-natural *bias* in human nature, as fallen toward that which is evil. In a word, he plainly implies that men are born, essentially, in the same moral condition in which Adam was created; that human nature is the same, not only in its elements, but in the proportion and balance of those elements, as it was originally. Hence, in order to reconcile this position with his admissions as to the actual prevalence of sin, he throws all the blame and burden of the world's universal sinfulness at the door of the evil spirit.

> "When I speak of the belief in the existence and presence of an evil spirit, as characteristic of the Gospels, I mean this:—that in them, first the idea of a spirit, directly and absolutely opposed to the Father of lights, to the God of absolute goodness and love, bursts full upon us. There first we are taught that it is not merely something in peculiarly evil men, which is contending against the good and the true; no, nor something in all men: that God has an antagonist; and that all men, bad or good, have the same. There, first, this antagonist presents himself to us, altogether as a spirit, with no visible shape or clothing whatsoever, &c. With these discoveries, another is always connected: that this tempter speaks to me, to myself, to the will; that over that he has established his tyranny; that there his chains must be broken; but that all things in nature, with the soul and the body, have partaken and do partake of the slavery to which the man himself has submitted."
>
> "I simply state these propositions; I am not going to defend them. If they cannot defend themselves by the light which they throw on the anticipations

and difficulties of the human spirit, by the hint of deliverance they offer it, by the horrible dreams which they scatter, my arguments would be worth nothing."—Pp. 44, 45.

* * * * * * * * *

"When men in the old time would have said bravely, meaning what they said, 'We are engaged in a warfare with an evil spirit, *he* is trying to separate us from God, to make us hate our brethren;' *we* talk of the depravity of our nature, of the evil we have inherited from Adam. Now, that every child of Adam has this infection of nature, I most entirely and inwardly believe.* But to say that this infection forces us to commit sin, is to say what the Jews of old said, what the prophets denounced as the most flagrant denial of God:—*We are delivered to do all these abominations.* And it is the *very* close approximation which we make in some of our popular statements to this detestable heresy, which has called forth an indignant and a righteous protest from many classes of our countrymen, the Unitarians being in some sort the spokesmen for the rest. When we try to avoid this censure, it is by the very feeble and pusillanimous course of introducing modifications into the broad phrases with which we started, modifications that make them mean almost nothing. We maintain the 'absolute, universal, all-pervading depravity' of human nature; but then there are 'beautiful relics of the divine image,' 'fallen columns,' &c.;—pretty metaphors, no doubt; but who wants metaphors on a subject of such solemn and personal interest?"—Pp. 48, 49.

Mr. Maurice's theory, however, as Dr. Candlish has well shown, will not account for the facts of the case. How can it be that in the case of every man, if human nature still retains its integrity, "the tempter has established his tyranny over the will," so that "all things in nature, with the soul and the body, have partaken and do partake of the slavery to which the man himself has submitted?" Mr. Maurice attempts to explain *ignotum per ignotius.* We apprehend that to account for so "universal" and "absolute" a submission to the tyranny of the evil spirit, it will be needful to presuppose something equivalent to a "universal" and "absolute" pravity of will and nature in mankind.

Essays II and III, on "Sin" and the "Evil Spirit," are naturally followed by Essay IV, on "The Sense of Righteousness in Men, and their Discovery of a Redeemer." We have already intimated, that, in reference to the principles and bearing of Mr. Maurice's peculiar theology, this is the most significant and suggestive of the "Essays." We can only, however, afford to quote from it very sparingly. The whole essay is founded on the book of Job. The experience of Job is considered as substantially representative of the experience of every sufferer; and therefore, since all men, more or

---

* "Infection of nature." This is the phrase he has subscribed to. See the ninth article of the Church of England. Compare with this sentence what immediately precedes, and also the latter sentences of the quotation. Compare also what is said before, (p. 46,) "Neither body nor soul can be in itself evil. Each is in bondage to some evil power." But Mr. Maurice can go very far in using orthodox phrases.

less, are sufferers, of the experience, at some time and in some measure, of every man.

> "Every thoughtful reader of the book of Job must have been struck by two characteristics of it, which seem, at first sight, altogether inconsistent. The suffering man has the most intense personal sense of his own evil. He makes also the most vehement, repeated, passionate, protestations of his own righteousness."—P. 54.

* * * * * * * * *

> "I believe most clergymen, most religious persons, who have conversed at all seriously with men of any class, from the most refined to the most ignorant, in any state of mind, from that of the most contented Pharisee to that of the lowest criminal, have another test of the authenticity of the book as a record of actual humanity. They hear from one and all, in some language or other, the assertion of a righteousness which they are sure is theirs, and which cannot be taken from them. They may call themselves miserable sinners; some of them may feel that they are so; some may tremble at the judgment which they think is coming upon them for their sins. But in all there is a secret reserve of belief, that there is in them that which is not sin, which is the very opposite of sin. When you tell them the feeling is very wrong, that 'God be merciful to me' is the only true prayer, that God's law is very holy, that they have violated it, and so forth,—they will listen—they may assent. From prudence, or deference to you, they may suppress the offensive phrase, or change their tone. Those will not be the best and honestest who do so." . . . . "Each man has got this sense of a righteousness, whether he realizes it distinctly or indistinctly, whether he expresses it courageously or keeps it to himself."—Pp. 60, 61.

* * * * * * * * *

> "We say, we wish to bring the sinner, weary, heavy-laden, and hopeless, to Christ." . . . . "Do we not really believe that Christ was, before he took human flesh and dwelt among us? Do we not suppose that he actually conversed with prophets and patriarchs, and made them aware of his presence? Or is this a mere arid dogma, which we prove out of Pearson, and which has nothing to do with our inmost convictions, with our very life? How has it become so? Is it not because we do not accept the New Testament explanation of these appearances and manifestations; because we do not believe that Christ is in every man, the source of all light that ever visits him, the root of all the righteous thoughts and acts that he is ever able to conceive or do?"—Pp. 63, 64.

* * * * * * * * *

> "We say boldly to the man who declares that he has a righteousness which no one shall remove from him—'That is true, you have such a righteousness. It is deeper than all the iniquity which is in you. It lies at the very ground of your existence. And this righteousness dwells not merely in a law which is condemning you, it dwells in a Person in whom you may trust. The righteous Lord of man is with you, . . . nigh you, at your heart.'"—P. 66.

The same idea underlies the following essays (V and VI) on "The Son of God" and "The Incarnation," and is in some parts, especially pages 81–84, and page 117, very explicitly restated. We cannot, however, attempt to trace the line of speculation which runs through these essays; neither shall we analyze the following essay on "The Atonement." We have already indicated the position which Mr. Maurice of necessity maintains on this subject. Per-

haps, however, this may be the fittest place to refer specifically to those sad and shameful misrepresentations of the evangelical doctrine of "atonement," which so unhappily distinguish this work, and abound in every part of it. At page 126, Mr. Maurice speaks of evangelical views on the subject of the relations between God and man, as "dark and horrible thoughts respecting our Father in heaven and our fellow-creatures on earth, which exist among us, and which we have adopted from heathenism." This is about an average sample of the phraseology which Mr. Maurice is accustomed to employ in stigmatizing the views of the vast majority of earnest Christians throughout the world. In this sort of thing Mr. Maurice is a worthy follower of Priestley and Belsham. So far, indeed, from having, when he left the fellowship of Unitarians, lost their principles and *animus* in reference to the peculiar evangelical type of theology,—the theology of Cowper, and Wilberforce, and Buxton, and Archbishop Sumner,—he gives ample proof in this volume that he has fully inherited their spirit, and highly cultivated his inheritance. We may particularly refer, in proof of this assertion, to pages xiii, xxiii, xxv, 10, 12, 30, 48, the whole of the essay on the Atonement, to pages 205, 206, and the concluding essay on Eternal Life and Eternal Death. The most Antinomian type of ultra-Calvinism, as conceived and adopted by men of the grossest minds and the most fierce and fanatical tempers, does not come up to his representations of the ordinary doctrine and feelings of evangelical Christians of the nineteenth century. We shall not take upon ourselves the irksome and disgusting task of quoting his misrepresentations; but shall merely give one admirable passage from Dr. Candlish's examination of the essay on the Atonement, in which most of them are briefly but sufficiently corrected:—

> "There is nothing new in these objections against the doctrine of a vicarious or expiatory sacrifice. They have been urged by Unitarians, and fully answered, times without number. The novelty is to find them in a defence of the doctrine of the atonement; and the surpassing wonder is to see an English theologian. at this hour, so thoroughly ignorant of what really is the doctrine of 'Archbishop Magee,' and those who hold in substance his views, and at the same time so dogmatic in claiming for himself the authority of the Bible and the creeds, without once glancing at the texts, or at the articles which directly bear upon the question at issue. (P. 148.) Let the case be fairly stated for the defenders of the current evangelical belief. We do not hold that Christ, in any sense, changed the will of the Father. We do not hold that the atonement moved the Father to love the world, but that the Father so loved the world as to provide the atonement. We do not admit the substitution of Christ in the room of the guilty to be artificial; we believe it to be real and actual; we believe it to be the gracious appointment of the sovereign will of God; and we believe that, because Christ is the actual representative of men, he is on that very account qualified to be their substitute. We do not put Christ's endurance of inconceivable sufferings as our substi-

tute, instead of his entering into our actual miseries and bearing our griefs; we believe both. We believe in the sympathy of Christ with us, as well as in the substitution of Christ for us; and we believe the sympathy to be all the more tender and true on account of the substitution. We do not believe that he rescued men out of the hand of God, by paying a penalty to him; but as little do we believe that he rescued them out of the power of an enemy by yielding to his power. We believe that he did not yield to the enemy's power, but triumphed over it. He yielded to death, not because the enemy had any power over him, but because the Father gave him the cup to drink. We do not put 'penalty for sin' instead of 'sin' in the passage about the Lamb of God taking away the sin of the world. But we ask, what persons accustomed to the sacrificial language and ideas of the Old Testament would understand by that phrase? And we ask, what that other passage means, 'Christ hath redeemed us from the curse of the law, being made a curse for us?' We do not suppose that Christ has destroyed the connexion between sin and death. We hold, that he has ratified and confirmed it more emphatically than if all sinners had perished. The Holy One, taking the responsibility—the guilt—of our sin upon himself, accepted the wages of sin, which is death. We do not say that the law must execute itself. The Lawgiver must execute his own law; and it is for him to judge if, in any instance, a substitute may stand for the guilty. We do not represent God as satisfied by the punishment of sin. We speak, indeed, of the justice of God, or his holy law, being satisfied,—its claims being met,—its violated majesty being vindicated,—when sin is punished. But this is a very different thing from representing God as feeling a personal satisfaction in punishing a sin; which is clearly what the author means to ascribe to us. We hold strongly, that God can be satisfied only when he beholds his own image in man, as he did at first, and in Christ Jesus does again. We believe, finally, that the death of Christ is a sacrifice, both because it is the entire surrender of the whole spirit and body to God, and also because this surrender implied that 'he bore our sins in his own person on the cross.' We believe that it is not a sacrifice of man to God, but a sacrifice for man; the sacrifice, the vicarious and expiatory suffering of the representative of man, the substitute for man,—the man Christ Jesus, who gave himself a ransom for all,—who gave his life a ransom for the many.

"'It moves one's deepest sorrow to see a man like this author trying to gain his case by mere abuse of the opposite counsel. Let it be granted that in popular statements of the doctrine of the atonement unguarded expressions may be found. Surely one so learned and so charitable ought to know that he is fighting against a wooden Soldan,—a mere man of straw; and that he is offensively caricaturing a belief, which to the very many poor afflicted ones is the very life of their souls. Is he not aware, that the true and only idea he has to deal with is the idea of substitution? Let him expunge that idea.—not loose declamation about it,—not ignorant perversions of it,—but the idea itself, —out of the Bible, out of the creeds. Let him expunge it out of the great conscience of mankind. Then his cause is won.'"—*Candlish's Examination*, pp. 228–231.

Passing over all the intervening essays, VIII to XVI, on the Resurrection, Justification, Regeneration, the Ascension, the Judgment Day, Inspiration, the Holy Spirit, the Unity of the Church, and the Trinity in Unity, we come to the last, the subject of which is "Eternal Life and Eternal Death."

On this subject the only question with us is, "What saith the Lord?" The problem of the government of the universe is too

vast for us to undertake to investigate it *à priori*. When the Divine Governor has himself revealed to us his method and principles, we think *a posteriori* arguments may be found to justify the ways of the Almighty. But such arguments should always be kept in their right place; and the ablest and most comprehensive system of argument must always leave very much unconsidered—because there must ever be very much unknown by us in our dim and distant seclusion—that is most essential to a right understanding and satisfactory determination of the whole question. Besides, if we were disposed to discuss this question with Mr. Maurice, we should at once be stopped by the fact that he and we disagree upon fundamental principles. It is certain that he must reject the doctrine of the eternal punishment of the wicked, because he does not believe in punishment at all. In fatherly chastisement he does believe, but not in punishment. On his principles, the government of the universe is carried on without law—in the proper sense. He knows nothing of any outward objective law; the only law he believes in is an inward, instinctive, impulsive principle of love. His scheme does away with probation in any sense, unseats the Supreme Judge from his tribunal, and resolves into powerless metaphor and periphrasis the judgment day. Judicial sentence and punishment can, therefore, have no place in his theory. The eternity of punishments, then, is not *the* question in controversy with Mr. Maurice.

Mr. Maurice does not plainly state this. To discuss or argue is not his vocation—only to teach; as he thinks his audience may be able to bear it, and to denounce what he dislikes. He follows in this essay his usual plan. With fearful profanity he exhibits a gross exaggeration and caricature of the most repulsive and materialized type of supralapsarian Calvinism, and denounces this as the common faith of evangelical Christendom. Thus he endeavours to effect his purpose by a most unfair and discreditable *argumentum ad invidiam*. In this, however, there is nothing new. It is the old device of infidels and semi-infidels in every age. It would not have been surprising in a coarse Unitarian of the last age. But it is surprising—in this respect it *is* something new and passing strange—in a cultivated clergyman of the orthodox Episcopal Church of England, in the middle of the nineteenth century.

The only point in Mr. Maurice's last essay which calls for notice from us in this article, is the criticism, if such it may be called, by which he endeavours to explain away from the word *eternal*—particularly as used in Matt. xxv, 46, to designate the life of the righteous, and the punishment of the wicked—any idea of everlastingness.

Mr. Maurice admits that the word *αἰώνιος* would very naturally have conveyed the sense of everlastingness to the ordinary Greek; but inasmuch as it is used in Scripture to designate the nature of God, and of that life which consists in the knowledge of God, he holds that the signification of everlastingness must be quite inadequate to the word as employed by the sacred writers. Neither will he allow that, as applied to the nature of God, the word may have the high sense of "without beginning as well as without end," and in other cases merely the sense of "*endless*" or "*everlasting*." He affirms that, to whatever subject applied, the adjective must of necessity signify the same quality. He therefore contends that the true sense of the word *eternal*, as used in Scripture, is *that which is fixed and absolute, above and apart from time, altogether aloof from the idea or sphere of duration, change, or succession.* This is the eternity of God; this is the eternity of holy life; this is the eternity of punishment for the wicked. But, surely, Mr. Maurice does not think that the same quality of fixedness and absoluteness, apart from and above all change, succession, or duration, which belongs to the self-existent God, also belongs to the derived life of the saint, and to the punishment of the wicked. If this could be the case, we do not see how the prospect would be at all less dark for the wicked than on the common interpretation. But the idea is most incongruous and monstrous. Let Mr. Maurice try as he will, he must apply the word *eternal* in a different sense to the life of saints and to the punishment of the wicked, from that in which he would apply it to qualify the nature of God. Mr. Maurice's proof-text from Scripture in favour of his view is John xvii, 3: "This is life eternal, that they might know thee the only true God," &c. Here he assumes that *eternal* is defined to be that which consists in the knowledge of God. If this were the case, it would utterly upset his theory; since how can the *punishment* of the wicked be eternal in this sense, or how can the eternity of the Father of spirits be said to consist in such knowledge? But, in fact, all that St. John teaches us is, that the knowledge of God is life, and that this life, as it stands essentially related to the immortal spirit and the eternal God, is in its nature and reach eternal.

As for the assertion that the popular sense of *eternal* is modern, and owes its prevalence to the sensational philosophy of Locke, it is too futile to require examination. Indeed, Mr. Maurice's admission, that *αἰώνιος* in Greek and *æternus* in Latin bore this sense in ordinary, is a sufficient refutation. Mr. Maurice's sense of *eternal* was never the popular sense, and never could have been. Scholastic philosophers and divines have often propounded some

such sense; but the popular mind has never been able to conceive it.

We need scarcely remark that even if Mr. Maurice had succeeded in invalidating the force of that one text, (Matt. xxv, 46,) which so distinctly teaches the everlasting punishment of the wicked, the doctrine he wishes to get rid of would still remain inextricably bound up with Scripture teaching. The abiding continuance of future punishment—the hopelessness and helplessness of all who die in impenitency—is taught in a multitude of passages in Scripture, where no word equivalent to *eternal* occurs; and, if we deny this, we must cease to seek for our doctrines in the revelations of Scripture.

Mr. Maurice declines to say distinctly whether he believes in universal salvation or not. The fact is, he hardly *can* say, because he does not believe in damnation in any sense. On his theory, probation is prolonged indefinitely, if we should not rather say that probation is altogether done away. Men may be rebellious children, and therefore unhappy; but they are never condemned, and never incapable of turning to God and being happy. At their worst estate, the Son of God is with them and in them. The following remarkable passage has a bearing upon this subject. It occurs in Essay VIII, in the course of Mr. Maurice's explanation of our Lord's descending "into hell."

> "I accept [these words] as news that there is no corner of God's universe over which his love has not brooded, none over which the Son of God and the Son of man has not asserted his dominion. I claim a right to tell this news to every peasant and beggar of the land. I may bid him rejoice and give thanks, and sing merry songs to the God who made him, because there is nothing created which his Lord and Master has not redeemed, of which he is not the King."—P. 162.

We feel tempted to remark upon the fact, that such views as we have now exhibited have emanated from a clergyman of the Church of England, who holds by and expounds in his own sense the Creeds and the Articles; but we must come to a close. Our readers will understand that we have only followed the main line of thought in this scheme of heresy. There are hundreds of slanders and fallacies which were lodged—often in shoals together—in every direction, right and left, of our course; but we could not go out of our way to refute or expose them. Those who wish for a detailed examination and refutation of these should procure Dr. Candlish's able volume; the only fault of which is, that having failed to perceive the principle which lies at the bottom of Mr. Maurice's theosophy, as we think we may call it, the writer has not enabled his readers to attain to a synthetic and comprehensive view of the whole scheme.

ART. IV.—WILLIAM JAY.

The Autobiography of the Rev. William Jay; with Reminiscences of some Distinguished Contemporaries, Selections from his Correspondence, and Literary Remains. Edited by GEORGE REDFORD, D. D., LL. D., and JOHN ANGELL JAMES. New-York: Carter & Brothers. Two vols., 12mo., pp. 418, 336. 1855.

IN the preface to the Life of Rev. Cornelius Winter, written by his early protégé and steadfast admirer, William Jay, of Bath, is found the following significant sentence:—"For the purposes of biography, those lives are the most eligible that are the most imitable; and these are derived from characters that belong to our own community, that are formed in the same relations and conditions with ourselves; whose circumstances make us feel, for the time, the emotions which would be excited by the same good or evil happening to ourselves; whose attainments, while they resulted from the divine blessing, appear not to have been preternatural, but were made under no greater advantages than our own; whose progress was not less owing to the stroke of the oar than the favourableness of the wind; whose excellences, while they do not discourage us by their perfection, animate us by their degree; whose success teaches us, not how to be great, but how to be good and happy; whose piety is not fluctuating, but steady; not visionary, but producing a beautiful correspondence to all the claims of the station in which they are placed." This ideal character which the admiring young biographer supposed he saw so nearly realized in his subject, found a much more complete realization in himself, as he now appears in the records of his protracted and well-ordered life.

An active ministry of seventy years, and an uninterrupted pastorate over the same Church and congregation of more than sixty, are themselves things of very unusual occurrence in our changing and uncertain times. But wonder is changed to admiration when we learn that the subject of this unusual stability and continuity of action so husbanded his resources and concentrated his efforts upon his high calling, that with only moderate natural parts, and in spite of a very inadequate early education, he not only attained to eminence as a preacher of the gospel, but became a voluminous writer; so that when now his voice is hushed in death, he still speaks to multitudes of the way of salvation. When the present generation came upon the stage of action the minister of Argyle Chapel, in Bath, was in the strength of his manhood, and had already attained to eminence and notoriety, to which increasing years, without dimming

the lustre of the reputation before attained, only added the soft radiance of a long-delayed summer's sunset.

Such a character presents an unusually inviting theme for the pen of the biographer. The whole Church has a heritage in the memoirs of such a man, and universal humanity presents a claim to those to whom the work belongs, for a properly prepared record of his illustrious career. But the very excellences of character which invite us to contemplate and admire, render the task of just delineation especially difficult. Ordinary themes may be treated by moderate talents, but greatness in the subject requires corresponding qualities in him who would portray them for our admiration. And as those objects whose beauty consists in the symmetry of all their parts rather than in some single striking feature require the greatest skill in their delineation, so a character distinguished for no one striking trait, but great in the possession and exercise of whatever contributes to a perfect man, is less easily sketched than that of the hero, statesman, or orator, whose characteristics are given in a single word. It is not wonderful, therefore, that although the good old man has gone to his final recompense, leaving an admiring world gazing upon his vacant place, or contemplating his memory, as yet no biography of him, at all answering to the demands of the case, has been given to the public.

In making this remark, we intend not to express any disrespect to the volumes named at the head of this paper. They are, indeed, a valuable contribution to religious literature. But whoever shall take them up, expecting to find in them a history of the eventful career of their nominal subject, and a satisfactory estimate of his character, is doomed to be disappointed. A little more than half of the first volume is made up of what purports to be an autobiography of Mr. Jay, but is rather a rapid sketch of his early life, and some remarks upon his manner of life as a preacher, a pastor, a student, and an author. These remarks, and the particular information they convey, must be very satisfactory to those who, like the persons to whom they were addressed in the form of familiar letters, were already well informed as to all the general facts of the writer's history; to all others they cannot fail to be unsatisfactory. Some amends for the manifest barrenness of the autobiography are made by the appended "observations" by the editors on the character of the subject, as a preacher and a writer.

Greatness comes seldom by inheritance. It is sometimes innate, but oftener accidental, or at best incidental. With Mr. Jay it was certainly not of the first, for his ancestry is unusually obscure. In entering upon his autobiography he felicitates himself that he has

"not to trace a long and proud lineage;" and adds, "If any great and illustrious individuals have been found among my ancestors, they have not been ascertained in my family, in my own time." The name of Jay, so renowned in American history, is well known to be of French origin, the family being descended from a branch of the banished Huguenots, who, nearly two hundred years ago, found an asylum in the new world. It is not altogether improbable that the family of the good old man of Bath was from the same original stock, but removed to England by an earlier emigration.

His father was the son of a small farmer, but was himself a mechanic,—a stone-mason; and both the parents of our subject are described as persons of ordinary natural endowments, of humble education, and plain, practical common sense, "upright, conscientious, kind, tender, charitable according to their means, and much beloved and esteemed in all the neighbourhood." It is not at all wonderful that such a son should come of such parents. Not only does Providence disregard our artificial social distinctions in the endowments of the mind, but, on account of the simpler and more inartificial modes of living which prevail among the moderately poor, they often enjoy peculiar facilities for a vigorous mental development, whenever opportunities are afforded them. Wherever society is left free to adjust itself according to its own inherent laws, there will be a steady elevation of the lower (not the lowest) classes, and a like deterioration of the higher; while frequently individuals, outstripping the tendency of their own class, will either ascend or descend out of it, according to their own peculiar tendencies. Of this rule, on its better side, Mr. Jay's case is an illustrious example.

The story of the early school-training of celebrated scholars, statesmen, and divines, often affords strange and deeply interesting lessons. Of Mr. Jay's education, beyond the family circle, or rather of the two great agencies of that education, the Church and the school, he gives this account:—

> "The Presbyterian minister on whom we attended was a Clarkian Arian, (but he never dealt much in doctrines,) a very dry and dull preacher, but a lovely character, and exceedingly tender-hearted, kind, and generous. . . . . From my earliest remembrance he kindly and gently noticed me, and when I was able to read he presented me with the first two publications I ever called my own. . . . . Books were then very scarce in villages; at least few came in my way.
>
> "The schooling of the village was of course very limited, and had nothing to awaken or expand the mind beyond the commonest elements of reading, writing, and vulgar arithmetic. In this humble education I shared; but I can say nothing more: to any literary or intellectual advantage or excitement I was a stranger."—Pp. 21, 22.

His early life gave no indications of his future career. He learned to read with difficulty; and having few opportunities to advance any further, this was for a time the extent of his attainments. He was a lover of nature, as are most children who are kept from vicious indulgences and associations; and his childish fancies, like those of others, amused themselves in building airy castles of future greatness. At this point it seems probable he would have remained fixed, to live and die as his predecessors had done,—unconscious of the powers within him, unknowing and unknown,—had not an occurrence, quite accidental as to himself in its procurement, arrested his attention, and thenceforth permanently determined both his character and course of life.

The state of religion in Tisbury, at the time in question, as in the generality of English villages at that date, was not prosperous. Yet the awakening which had begun to be felt a quarter of a century before in various parts of the kingdom, and had now reached almost every hamlet, had come to this place also. A wealthy gentleman, formerly a resident of the village, aware of the spiritual destitution of its people, procured and licensed a place of worship in it, to which the itinerant evangelists, then becoming somewhat numerous, and all known by the common name of Methodists, were invited. With this event the early religious history of our subject is intimately connected. But before proceeding to the statement of facts in the case we will pause to consider a passing remark, giving his own views of the subject thus brought to our notice:—

> " Some people love to talk of being born again, and of their being made new creatures, with a kind of physical certainty and exactness; and refer to their conversions, not as the real commencement of a work which is to continue increasing through life, but as something which may be viewed as a distinct and unique experience, immediately produced, originated, and finished at once; and perfectly determined as to its time, and place, and mode of accomplishment; but I hope this is not necessary, for *I have no such narrative or register to afford.* A distinction is not always made between depraved nature and actual transgression. All are sinners, and all have come short of the glory of God; but all are not profligate, nor, in *this* sense, do all speak of themselves as they had been the chief of sinners. *Restraint from evil is a mercy*, as well as sanctification and good works. I cannot speak, *as some do*, of going great lengths in iniquity, and thereby rendering a work of grace more sure and more divine. I bless God, I was from my childhood free from [gross] immoralities."—P. 26.

Probably some who have read, or may hereafter read this paragraph, will be offended with its seeming superficialness, and especially with its apparent reflection upon the experience and confessions of others, whose convictions for sin have been more pungent

than his seem to have been, and whose sense of the change, when pardon was sealed upon their hearts by the divine Comforter, was more clearly and pointedly indicated. The subject is worthy of a careful examination; and its proper adjustment requires the exercise of mutual candour. Mr. Jay's language in this case may be a little unfortunate; but we are unwilling to believe that anything is intended that ought to offend any real child of grace. The terms "born again" and "made new creatures" are certainly Scriptural expressions, employed by divine inspiration to indicate a most important fact in individual religious experience. The terms themselves, therefore, as well as the facts and phenomena which they *necessarily* imply, should be accounted sacred, and carefully preserved from contempt. But it is plain, beyond a question, that many of the phenomena of religious experience are variable, and subject to great modification, both from original constitution of mind and from the facts of individual history. Some minds are more susceptible to conviction than others, and especially is there a wide difference in the emotional exercises of different minds, under the influences of such convictions. Perhaps there never was a case of religious awakening in which its subject was not somewhat instructed in the gospel way of salvation, so that the bitterness of remorse and the anguish of guilty fear were modified by the hopes of forgiveness, and the assurance of the divine placability. In all such cases there is a conflict between the desponding and hopeful tendencies of his nature, and the prevalence of the one or the other is affected by a variety of facts and circumstances. With the fearful and hypochondriacal the sense of guilt often produces the most fearful agony of spirit, while the more hopeful and buoyant look with a comforting assurance to the provisions and promises of grace. So, too, where the natural depravity of the heart has been but partially developed, and where the conduct has been steadily under the influence of moral restraints, and the character partially formed on the basis of truth and right, we may not expect the same deep compunctions and self-condemnations as in the case of an awakened profligate, or long-practised transgressor. And as in that case the outward change of manners is less remarkable than in this, so, since the internal conflict is less violent, the point of transition will be less surely determined, and even the spiritual revolution will not be so clearly a matter of immediate consciousness. These remarks, however, can be applied only generally, as doubtless there are many cases to which they would not be pertinent. We are far from pretending that the operations of the divine Spirit are all governed by laws as fixed and invariable as the forces

of nature. "The wind bloweth where it listeth . . . . so is [it with] every one that is born of the Spirit."

It is certainly no cause of surprise, nor just occasion of doubt as to the genuineness of his conversion, that the experience of our young villager was not marked by those clear and sharp outlines that have distinguished the moral transition of others. And while we extend this candour to his case, we claim the like for those whose experience has taught them that such references to the time and circumstances of their conversion deserve better treatment than they often receive. That there was formerly, especially among the old Puritans, and to some extent among the early Methodists, both in England and in this country, a tendency to an excessive valuation of the mere incidents of conversion, is granted; but the time of danger from that cause is wholly past. Our cause of fear lies now on the opposite extreme—the tendency to treat only of generalities in this thing renders it dangerous lest the speciality of that great work, in which lies its essence and only value, should be overlooked and forgotten.

The causes that led immediately to his making a profession of religion, according to the evangelical notion, are thus stated:—

> "The private dwelling which Mr. Turner had purchased and licensed was first used for worship on the Saturday evening. I attended. The singing, the extemporaneousness of the address, and the apparent affection and earnestness of the speaker, peculiarly affected me; and what he said of the 'faithful saying and worthy of all acceptation, that Jesus Christ came into the world to save sinners,' was like rain upon the mown grass, or cold water to a thirsty soul. I scarcely slept that night for weeping and for joy."—P. 27.

He now continued to frequent the humble chapel, and soon, of course, came to be recognised by its little society as a professor of Christianity, after the new way. He mingled with them in their social devotion, and was presently called to lead in the exercise of prayer; and by his zeal and the correctness of his life he presently attracted the notice of those who were more specially charged with the oversight of this little band of believers.

It was some time in the year 1783, when William Jay was about fourteen years old, that the Rev. Cornelius Winter, of Marlborough, who, according to the practice of many evangelical ministers of his time, itinerated through a considerable region of surrounding country, having his "appointments" arranged in a continuous "circuit," added Tisbury to the number of his preaching places. Here the youthful mechanic was among his constant and deeply interested hearers—often attending in the same dress in which he prosecuted his trade—and, by his apparent interest and evident intelligence,

attracted the good man's notice. Among other methods of doing good, Mr. Winter was accustomed to receive a few lads of promising character into his family, to be educated for the ministry. As he was from the first very much prepossessed in favour of the boy, he presently proposed to himself and his parents the project he had formed of removing the lad to his free seminary, or, more properly, clerical gymnasium. The proposed arrangements were not difficult of accomplishment,—for poverty makes all changes easy,—and the youthful stone-mason became an inmate of the dwelling of the itinerating evangelist—the youthful William Jay was domiciled with the family of the good Cornelius Winter. From the beginning, the attachment between the two seems to have been unusually strong and steady, and quite reciprocal. The instructer fancied he saw in his youthful protégé the germs of future greatness, while he in turn seemed to see all manner and degrees of excellences in his patron and benefactor. The biography of Mr. Winter, the result of Mr. Jay's earliest attempt at proper authorship, is a monument of their mutual and deathless affection,—recording at once the excellences of its subject and the lively gratitude of its author.

In his new position, young Jay was apprenticed to a new calling. He had laid aside the hammer and trowel, and taken up the word of the Lord. He was now to be taught and disciplined to become a wise master-builder—building up the foundation of prophets and apostles. And as his instruction in the rudiments of the material art had been rather practical than theoretical, so now he was to learn the business of preaching the gospel less by didactic instructions than by actual practice. At sixteen, such had been his proficiency, that he was regularly employed by Mr. Winter upon his "circuit," and everywhere his coming was hailed with admiration and pious joy.

At nineteen, impelled by his poverty to make some provision for his own maintenance, he reluctantly consented to assume the responsibilities of pastor of the little Independent society at Christian Malford, in whose obscurity he hoped to be hidden till increased age and experience should fit him for a wider field. But his concealment was very imperfect. He was frequently called to officiate in the larger towns of his vicinity; and at length, having made the acquaintance of the celebrated Rowland Hill, then at the height of his reputation, he was invited to preach in Surrey Chapel. The occasion of his advent to the metropolis was one of no little interest both to himself and his audience. His fame had gone before him, and expectation was on tiptoe. So great was the eagerness to hear him that only a moiety of the congregation that assembled could gain

access to the interior of the vast edifice; yet they lingered about the doors and windows, and after the services within he was persuaded to address the multitude without from one of the windows. But few young men could escape such temptations with impunity.

We yield to the temptation which the subject offers, and turn aside from the narrative to consider the question suggested by it, as to the best manner of preparing for the work of the ministry, and the propriety of allowing partially educated men to assume its functions. It has been so often and steadily asserted, almost entirely without dissent, that scholarship is highly desirable, if not absolutely essential, as a qualification for the sacred office, that to call it in question may seem like temerity, if indeed it escape the suspicion of madness. Nevertheless, we venture the opinion that great scholarship is neither needful nor desirable for one whose chief business in life is to fill the offices of a Christian pastor. That the Church needs scholarship in her ministry is granted; and that all ministers should "study to show themselves approved workmen that need not to be ashamed, rightly dividing the word of truth," is also conceded. But it is not a legitimate inference to assume that therefore all ministers ought to be ripe scholars. The pastoral office is itself a work sufficient to fill the hands and the heart of any man; but he who would be a scholar must make study the great business of his life. A man may be an able minister of the New Testament without such an amount of study as would seriously interfere with his pastoral duties; but to become a scholar that shall be worthy of the name, or successful in his scholarship, he must sacrifice his pastoral work to his studies.

On the question of permitting young and partially educated persons to preach, Mr. Jay suggests certain considerations, which, on account of their practical wisdom, we copy and commend to the reader's consideration. After granting that some disadvantages result from this course, especially among very young men, and with students, he gives the following list of "compensatory advantages":—

> "*First*, Hereby good was done in the conversion of sinners, in many instances, some of which were very striking; and what is the gain of the whole world to the value of one soul?
>
> "*Secondly*, The usage tended by its exercise, and by the preparation for it, to keep the minds of the students in things of God.
>
> "*Thirdly*, It was a great advantage to the young pupil to begin before he knew too much, to feel certain difficulties, and to gain confidence and facility by practice. And thus, *though the scholar was injured, the preacher was benefitted*."—Pp. 41, 42.

These views were the settled convictions of their author, which the observation of a long life, passed in circumstances peculiarly favourable to the formation of a correct judgment in the case, seemed

only to confirm. In a letter to a friend, written in 1846, he remarks:—

> "Our preaching is too commonly of a cast, I am sorry to say, not the most calculated to do good. The mathematics and classics are good in their places; but unless men have something else, they will never make ministers of the New Testament."

After a little more than a year's residence at Christian Malford, while on a visit to Bristol, he became acquainted with Lady Maxwell, to whom belonged Hope Chapel, at the Hotwells, then recently opened. At the earnest solicitation of her ladyship, Mr. Jay consented to supply the pulpit temporarily, which he accordingly did for nearly a whole year. He was strongly urged both by the lady-patroness and the principal persons of the congregation to become the settled pastor, which at first he was inclined to do, but afterward changed his purpose. According to the usage of the times, a "minister's house" was attached to the chapel, at which the patroness kept a kind of family establishment, residing there herself when in those parts, and leaving it in the charge of a governess in her absence. This governess Mr. Jay believed quite transcended her rightful authority, and interfered with his by meddling too freely and dictatorially with the spiritual affairs of the society,and congregation. In recording this part of his history he confesses that the fault in the case may have been mutual, and confesses the many excellences of his fair antagonist, but adds significantly:—"With all my regard for the sex, and submission in domestic affairs, I do not plead for female ecclesiastical rule, whether supreme or subordinate."

While Mr. Jay was yet at Christian Malford he was called to fill the pulpit of the Independent chapel at Bath, during the temporary illness of its minister, the Rev. Mr. Tuppin, where he found great favour with the people. The next year Mr. Tuppin's health entirely gave way, and Mr. Jay was again often in his pulpit. During the period between the two seasons of his temporary service at Bath, Argyle Chapel was erected for the accommodation of the largely increasing congregation that had been gathered by Mr. Tuppin's ministry; and when it was completed, its opening was for some time delayed on account of the sickness of the minister,—it being the common wish of his people and himself that he should perform that service. But as his recovery at length became quite desperate it was deemed inexpedient to wait any longer, and, with a kind of prophetic fitness, that service devolved on Mr. Jay. Soon after this event occurred the demise of the good pastor, who with his expiring breath named the young man from Bristol as his most eligible successor, a nomination which the officers of the Church and the

society and congregation heartily approved; and the invitation that soon followed was accepted without much hesitation by the pastor elect. The ceremonies of ordination and induction took place without unnecessary delay, and the hitherto young itinerant and village preacher became, once for all, the pastor of Argyle Chapel, Bath. The Rev. Mr. Winter, who for seven years had watched his upward progress as that of a star of peculiar radiance, now seemed to see his fullest expectation realized, as he offered the prayer of consecration and delivered the usual charge to his beloved son in the gospel.

Hitherto the life of Mr. Jay had its share of vicissitudes; but thenceforward to the end,—a period of more than sixty years,—his history is as barren of startling incidents, as it is rich in treasured memories of unostentatious goodness, and the records of a life of almost unparalleled ministerial usefulness. Into the details of that history we do not purpose to enter, though it might be agreeable to retrace a history so replete with blessings, both domestic and social, and a ministry so abundantly crowned with the blessings of Heaven. Few men could with equal propriety appropriate the language of the ninety-first Psalm,—especially its closing declarations.

Our further remarks must be confined to the consideration of the more general features of the subject before us,—his character as a man and a preacher, and especially the means and agencies by which he achieved such wonderful results.

In examining Mr. Jay's character, one is not so much struck with any one commanding feature as with the symmetry of the whole, and the almost perfect harmony of its parts. His intellectual powers, though respectable, were not extraordinary. No one capable of forming an intelligent opinion on the subject, would set him down as either a profound thinker or an acute reasoner. In these particulars he made no pretensions himself, for he knew himself, and seldom or never ventured beyond his measure. Nor, as has been shown, was he a man of much learning. His early opportunities (if that term can be applied to the provision for instruction enjoyed in his childhood) were exceedingly meagre; and when at fourteen he went to reside with Mr. Winter, he was rather apprenticed to the business of preaching than put to school to learn the sciences. Of scholarship neither he nor his preceptor had any very precise notions; while he learned from the Bible and a few books of devotional theology, and from the conversations of his revered teacher, the matter of which he made up the body of his village sermons. Before he had reached the years of his majority he was charged with the care of a society, which, with constant

preaching, afforded him but little opportunity for general reading and study. And these things, made probable by his early circumstances, are abundantly confirmed both by his subsequent history and by his written works.

Yet in one particular evidently his mind was strongly marked. He had great steadiness of purpose and a commendable degree of independence of character, and this gave him great efficiency of action. This is observable in every part of his history, and tempered, as it was, by a sincere though not remarkably ardent piety, it made him really a greater man than many others of greatly superior parts. To this trait of his mental character his physical constitution contributed its part. The child of plain and honest parents, he inherited a sound frame of body, which served him as the efficient agent of an earnest and active mind; and by the healthful flow of life's current his spirit was raised above hypochondriac vapours, and his capacity for both action and enjoyment greatly enlarged. Men are generally but imperfectly aware of the extent to which the condition of the body influences the states of the mind, fashioning the character and determining the career of the person. We accordingly find that during his long life Mr. Jay enjoyed a large share of good health,—that he was accustomed to take hopeful views of all subjects,—to see the bright side of every object,—and so by expecting only good, as well as appreciating the present possession, he was fitted at once to contribute to the happiness of others, and to accomplish his own purposes. To these things we are doubtless to look as some of the chief causes of his success in life; though others, while acting a subordinate part, aided essentially in that work. Gifted by nature with a pleasing elocution, he found a ready access to the hearts of the people,—for nothing so readily secures the favour of the hearers to the speaker, as to be enabled to listen without effort, and to understand without study, and at the same time to be gratified with beauties, and have the mind elevated and carried forward by a pleasing succession of images. Probably his want of profound learning rather helped than hindered his acceptance with his hearers, for people who have never taught themselves to think,—that is all but one in a thousand,—do not wish to be compelled to the unwelcome duty, nor will they be interested with discourses that rise far above or extend much beyond their own narrow range of thought. They who watch for souls, ought to remember that most persons will not consent to be taught much at once; and if the preacher, taking advantage of his position, attempts so to teach them, they in turn will avail themselves of their liberty of with-

holding their attention or attendance from the unasked-for lessons. Readiness of utterance, a chaste but active imagination, and a genial but not exuberant fancy, all aided in making him a favorite with the "common people;"—and distinguished by this trait of character, that class is almost universal. But happily for the permanence of his popularity, Mr. Jay did not rely upon these fortuitous advantages to the neglect of mental culture and steady efforts to store his mind with the needed intellectual furniture. Upon this rock many a promising young minister has made shipwreck. Elated with the manifestations of public favour, and forgetting the evanescent nature of their means of commanding it,—that beauty soon cloys, unless it is associated with intrinsic worth—that the fascinations of youth quickly pass away, and that the crowd which has been drawn together by novelty and occasional excitement, can be detained only by something more substantial,—how many have studied only to please with meretricious beauties when they should have been chiefly solicitous to profit by wholesome truth, while the starving multitude have been fed on flowers instead of fruits, and made to breathe delicious but enervating perfumes instead of the life-giving breath of heaven. A career conducted in this wise is doomed to a speedy and inglorious termination;—a descent more rapid than their ascent is as certain to all who rely on such means of popularity, as the relations of cause and effect,—a result that cannot be long delayed by the repetition of worn-out anecdotes, and overwrought figures of speech, and a profuse use of high-sounding expletives, set off with a due proportion of *pro tempore* emotion. Of this worse than folly William Jay was never guilty.

Aware of the defectiveness of his education, and stimulated by the favour shown toward his preaching, he from the beginning of his public career made his preparations for the pulpit the great business of his life. For this end he thought, and conversed, and read, and wrote. He who, if any man might do so, might have relied on his peculiar gifts, conducted himself as if he was ignorant of possessing any such unusual attraction. Each Sabbath found him in his pulpit with a message to the people prepared for that occasion. The constant attendants upon his ministry heard at each coming what they had never before heard, and the stranger who heard him for the first time discovered an earnestness and freshness in the discourse that made him desire to listen again to the same voice. Perhaps he had an ambition to be great; but it was at once a lofty and a holy ambition, and well did he choose his course to accomplish its purpose. "He clearly saw," says one who both knew and

appreciated his character, "that, if he would do one great thing well, he must concentrate his powers upon *that*, and make everything else give place, or become subservient to it." This he did, and the result is seen in his extensive usefulness and eminent success. Had he divided his efforts, and sought to be a man of general information,—a scholar as well as a preacher,—he would probably have attained to eminence in neither. And is there not cause to suspect that the opposite course is too often the one pursued by the more active and intelligent portion of our young ministers, to the detriment at once of themselves and of their congregations?

A reference to some of Mr. Jay's characteristic peculiarities as a preacher, will illustrate both our general subject and the point more specially under notice. As to his *manner*, we avail ourselves of the remark of one of the editors of these volumes:—

> "Mr. Jay's voice was certainly one of the charms of his preaching. It was sonorous, but not loud, alternating between bass and tenor; strong yet soft; musical and flexible; and more adapted to give expression to what is tender, pathetic and solemn, than to what is lively, impetuous and impulsive. If it did not stir you as with the blast of a trumpet, it soothed and delighted you, as with the soft tones of a flute. This indeed was the general character of his preaching, in which the manner was suited to the matter."—Vol. ii, p. 290.

Mr. Jay was evidently, in the fullest sense of the word, an INDEPENDENT minister. He belonged to no particular class or order, either in manner, doctrines, or specific Church discipline. In prayer, his manner was the very opposite of that which distinguished the old Nonconformists, and still more the public exercises of many of their successors. Here again we quote from the editors' remarks with approbation:—

> "Occasionally there is *too much of preaching* in prayer; too much of [dogmatic] theology; too little of petition and confession. . . . . We do not wonder that Church people of refinement who occasionally attend dissenting worship, complain of a want of solemnity and devout feeling in our prayers; yet were *extempore* prayer performed as it should be, they would retire with a conviction of its superior appropriateness, earnestness and adaptation to the various classes of the congregation, and the changeful experience of the Christian heart."—Vol. ii, pp. 291, 292.

In preaching too he was equally his own model. Indeed, he probably heard very little preaching in his whole life-time, since from very early youth he was constantly engaged in preaching to others; and because he always had a purpose beyond the mere *performance* of the work, he gave less attention to the manner of execution than to results. He preached for effect, and so intuitively adopted the most effective modes of address. Hence he became eminently a *natural* speaker. The inflections of his voice

and the motions of his body were all quite inartificial; and as nature is always consistent with herself, his naturalness found a response in every hearer whose tastes and feelings had not been vitiated by a false education. Herein consisted that faculty which he possessed in so eminent a degree of interesting and pleasing at once the most refined and cultivated, and the most unlettered and rustic hearers. He spoke from nature, and nature responded to his voice.

Another fact that no doubt contributed largely to his ministerial success was his method of comprehending but a little in a single sermon. Generally a single point or truth constituted the matter of a discourse,—except when he made no attempt at sermonizing, but simply gave a running commentary upon the sacred text,—and this was presented in its various aspects and viewed in its several relations, and the whole presented and urged upon the hearts of the hearers as "a faithful saying and worthy of all acceptation." Especially were his discourses rich in illustrations from familiar objects in nature,—things familiar to and therefore always appreciated by the unlettered, and suited at once to arrest their attention and inform their understandings. His editor remarks:—

> "This talent for illustrative allusion was extraordinary. His sermons were not only, by his beautiful fancy, illuminated like the ancient missals, but illustrated like modern books, by descriptive scenes. They contained all the glowing colouring of the one, with the more correct and graceful forms of the other. Here his naturalness constantly appeared, and in close resemblance to that of our Lord, who drew his similes and metaphors from the works of nature and the relationships of humanity."—Pp. 296, 297.

Intimately related to the foregoing, and equally felicitous in its effects, was his constant and free use of Scripture facts and Scripture language. It is wonderful how strong is the veneration of the mass of a Protestant community for the very words and phrases of the sacred volume. Its language, though used only by accommodation, and its facts, when introduced merely as illustrations, are generally more decisive than the most perfect logical demonstrations; so that the preacher who deals freely in Scripture quotations and illustrates liberally by the facts given in the Bible, is almost sure of the assent of his hearers to the matter of his sermons. This was Mr. Jay's *forte*, continues the last-quoted writer.

> "This great preacher threw a sacred charm over his sermons by a profusion of Scripture phraseology, and allusion to Scripture facts. They were adorned with the beauty and redolent with the fragrance of flowers culled from the garden of inspiration. Indeed, the beauty and the perfume were almost in excess. The passages were not so much selected for proof as for illustration; they were brought forward as classic quotations are by public orators, to grace a speech and to convey the speaker's idea in the apposite language of a high authority."

But all these things would probably have failed of their purpose, had he not used his characteristic discernment and independence, by eschewing the fashion of his times and associates, of delivering their sermons from manuscripts. A congregation of scholars might possibly find both pleasure and profit in written sermons; and those who do not listen at all, and they who render all their religious services as a kind of penance, may tolerate such a substitute for preaching. But to have public discourses attractive, so that they will both arrest attention and directly move the sensibilities, sermons must be delivered *ex tempore*. This was Mr. Jay's course through the whole period of his ministry, and on no other particular, in the method of his public ministration, did he lay more stress than on this. He remarks:—

> "Persons of education may be approached through the intellect, but the poor generally are like women, whose heads are in their hearts. They are like poets, who feel before they think. Application is with them an effect rather than a cause. They attend not to feel, but must be made to feel in order to attend."
>
> "Extemporary speaking will always be more effective than what is read from composed documents, or doled forth from mere recollection. Animation is desirable, and with ordinary minds no other quality will fully supply the want of it."
>
> "Nothing that requires a lengthened connexion of argumentation will succeed with ordinary hearers. They are not accustomed to unbroken trains of thoughts or discussions. With them, if the preacher be wise, he will find out acceptable *words;* for the *words* of the wise are as goads and as nails. The mass are not mathematical; they are not logical. The deep and the subtle in reasoning will commonly escape them. Yet there is often in them largely the principle of common sense; and they are capable of taking in even a profound proof or argument if it be despatched with brevity and plainness."—*Autobiography*, pp. 158, 159.

It must be further noticed that Mr. Jay's independence of character extended further than to the manner of his public ministrations. In forming his creed he called no man master; and accordingly he seems to have belonged to no school or class of theologians. He was indeed commonly reckoned a moderate Calvinist; but if so, his Calvinistic creed had been most thoroughly eviscerated. It was like the play of Hamlet with the part of Hamlet left out. But some people, who are very fond of the name of Calvin, have little favour for whatever is peculiar to the Geneva theology, and so, extending the name of Calvinism over the entire body of the doctrines of the Reformation, they are able to strip their system of all its offensive peculiarities, and yet retain all that is really excellent under its name. But this course is equally disingenuous and unwise. A system of theology, distinguished by some specific name, must retain its specific traits, or forfeit its just claims to the name so used. Judged by this rule, Mr. Jay was not a Calvinist. From his associations and his

reading, his forms of expressions were often borrowed from the terminology of that school of theology; but he either steadily ignored, or else explicitly disavowed the peculiarities of that system. He confessed, as every wise man will, that there are mysteries in the divine administration which he could not solve; that the absolute sovereignty of God, and the free moral agency of man, were both truths plainly taught in Scripture; and while he confessed that he could not explain the mode of their harmonious co-existence, he nevertheless believed both, and left the matter of their adjustment to Him who sees and knows all things. Hence the God whom he worshipped, and whose law and grace he proclaimed, was to him and to his hearers at once glorious in his perfections, and infinite in mercy and goodness.

Most hearers dislike controversial preaching, and are not very scrupulous about points of doctrine. This is perhaps a fault, and it presents one of the difficulties with which a faithful minister is often called to contend. It is probable that Mr. Jay, in too great a degree, fell in with this unwise but prevailing sentiment,—not, however, from any temporizing spirit, but for the want of more definite convictions of the utility of the better course. Yet, though this defect detracted from the value of his ministry, it doubtless contributed much to its acceptance with his hearers.

Another element of success in Mr. Jay's preaching is liable to a still more direct reprehension than his want of definiteness in doctrinal statement. We allude to his not unfrequent violations of the gravity and decorum that become the house of God, and the worship of the sanctuary, by quaintness of manner and expressions, and by evidently studied attempts at small witticisms—a habit which grew upon him with his increasing years—indulged, it has been thought, to compensate for the decline of his mental vigour and the force of his imagination. Such a habit, if involuntary, is at best an unhappy tendency of mind—if cherished and cultivated, it becomes a fault, deserving our decided condemnation; for no momentary applause can excuse for such desecrations. The apology which he offers for this infelicity of manner, in his Preface to his "Short Discourses," is lame and unsatisfactory. We quote it for his benefit:—

> "Though he does not wish to indulge a bad taste, the author would ever remember that the preacher ought to have compassion on the ignorant, and on them that are out of the way. That which is too smooth easily slides off from the memory; and that which is lost in the act of hearing will do little good. It is desirable to get something that will *strike* and *abide;* something that, recurring again and again, will employ the thoughts and the tongue; and if this cannot be accomplished in certain instances [except] by modes of address which perhaps are not classically justifiable, should not a minister prefer utility to fame?"

It is not true that quips and oddities help to the recollection of the accompanying gospel truths: they rather unfit the mind for useful meditation at the instant; and also, either cause the entire forgetting of whatever of good was uttered, or else, by associating it with the strange and ludicrous, actually bar its future efficiency. To resort to their use, therefore, is not to "prefer utility to fame," but often precisely the reverse. It may be laid down as a general rule, with very few exceptions, that whatever tends to excite the risibility of the audience in public worship, is, in so far, an evil to be deprecated both for its own sake and for its effects, in opposition to the better tendencies of the accompanying services.

We have written the more fully on these defects or infelicities of this great preacher, from the conviction of danger, that so great an example might be plead in their favour, especially of the latter. Unhappily, imitators generally copy the worse rather than the better traits of their pattern; and as there is a fearful possibility—one indeed too often realized—that buffoonery may be mistaken for wit, and a grin construed as evidence of successful pulpit oratory, it becomes all who have any regard for the honour and efficiency of God's house to sedulously guard them against this form of desecration.

These defects were in him, however, so overbalanced with great and commanding excellences that they seemed comparatively of little account—though they were not altogether unlike the "dead flies" in "the ointment of the apothecaries"—his hearers much more frequently wept than smiled, and oftener remembered their own sins than the preacher's witticisms. A few specific points we have ventured to reprehend, while, as a whole, we admire and reverence the character here presented to our contemplation—entirely coinciding with the following observation, with which we close this paper:—"If the publication of Mr. Jay's life should serve no other purpose than to stir up the ministry to a more earnest and anxious endeavour to excel in this, their momentous sphere of official duty, and to present to them a model which they shall aim to copy, then it will be a subject of congratulation and thankfulness, that to the world has been given this memoir [though imperfect] of one whom Foster designated *the Prince of Preachers.*" C.

INDIANA ASBURY UNIVERSITY, *Jan.* 20, 1855.

Art. V.—LIBERAL AND EVANGELICAL CHRISTIANITY.

Natural Goodness; or, Honour to whom Honour is due. Suggestions toward an Appreciative View of Moral Men, the Philosophy of the Present System of Morality, and the Relation of Natural Virtue to Religion. By the Rev. T. F. Randolph Mercein, M. A. New York: Carlton & Phillips. 1854.

We give a hearty welcome to this volume. In the way of professional criticism alone, we should find a great deal in it to gratify our sense of intellectual merit. The spirit of secular literature, seeking the aroma of art for the simple sentiment of pleasure, might enjoy the present effort for its manly and graceful characteristics. There are thoughts here that certainly rise above the common region of mind. There are indications of analytic power, of subtle penetration, of far-reaching perception, that deserve the warmest appreciation. But apart from this the work has other recommendations. It addresses a refined, Christian taste, a sound, Christian scholarship, a truthful, Christian sympathy. Throughout the book there is a sensitiveness to the claims of honest thinking—a fraternal kindliness of temper—a genial air, that we admire exceedingly; and, at the same time, it is free from those amiable excesses, which so often make dangerous concessions to the latitudinarianism of the age. There are peculiarities in it that remind us of the clear, keen eye of Fletcher, of the muscular grasp of Chalmers, of the liberal culture of Arnold, of the sturdy strength of Foster. But nevertheless, it is marked by a tone of decided individuality. The independence of the volume is one of its prominent features. It follows its own line of argument as distinctly as a river traces its channel to the sea. It is not difficult to see the effect of contributing influences. Along the map of its course, we can locate mountain-springs and valley-streams, that have swelled its volume of waters, but they are tributaries only; the strong current flows from its own fountain and determines its own progress to the awaiting ocean.

First of all, then, we like "*Natural Goodness,*" because the author has evidently laboured to be a just and a generous thinker. If any man supposes that these attributes of thought can be separated in the higher contemplations of the mind, he has been betrayed into the servitude of a selfish and debasing philosophy; for no one sentiment is a sufficient guide to the intellect. The claims of justice are not to be settled without reference to the cultivated instinct of benevolence, nor is benevolence to assert its authority with an eye blinded

to the stern requisitions of justice. Where the mind is most open to the mutual interests of these great principles, acting in full view of their respective demands, and striving to conform to their wise precepts, it is best fitted to discover and enforce truth. The man of narrow views cannot appreciate this acute sensibility to whatever is broad and catholic in literature. And yet it is one of the fundamental conditions of all spiritual power. There is a chivalry in intellect as well as in life; there is a sense of others' rights—a lofty bearing, in which the most genuine humility takes the dignity of moral grandeur—a grace of manner in the sharpest thought and the boldest utterance that is worthy of cordial praise. Noble feelings always inspire noble sentiments; the imagination transfers the heart into the brain and animates the reason with its borrowed fervour. And especially is this the case in polemical writing; if the polemic is to be subordinate to the man, if the casuist is to be controlled by the philosopher, if the enthusiast is to be directed and restrained by the Christian, the whole nature of the writer must be brought under the dominion of truth and love in all their multiplied relations. Our author impresses us as a man of this cast. Reverencing the standards that we have been taught to venerate, and yielding nothing that might compromise the strict claims of Christian doctrine, he is yet modest, temperate, and charitable in his discussions. Whenever difficulties are apparent, they are frankly acknowledged and calmly considered; objectors are heard with fairness and patience; antagonists are treated courteously; and in no case does the author resort to those low arts which are sometimes honoured with the name of logic. Indeed, his constant aim appears to be to remove the subject out of the domain of scholastic logic, and unfold it on the ground of a simple and sincere Christian philosophy. His method is singularly free from the taint of suspicion. There is no studied effort to depreciate opposing views, or to ridicule hostile arguments. There is none of the strategy of literature in his tactics. The stealthy art, that kindles the false camp-fire or muffles its footstep in the advance of death on the enemy's line, is righteously disdained.

The spirit of the volume has, therefore, reached our heart. It is open, manly, ingenuous: it practises no cunning evasions; seeks no subterfuges; relies on no doubtful dexterity; avails itself of no disguises. It must be classed among controversial writings, but it is exempt from those vices which have defaced so large a portion of this department of religious literature. Men have been slow to learn that malignity can give no real strength to the intellect. If they look at the truth in its native excellence, armed with the strength and adorned with the beauty of God—mighty, alike in its

energy and repose—they are ready to admit, that in itself it is an all-conquering force by the emanations of birth and the glory of its commissioned ministry. But the moment it becomes their instrument, they are too prone to forget that they are God's agents. The warfare is reduced to carnal rules; and, in the heat of conflict, the religion of the understanding is often violated. The evil here is two-fold; not only is there a sacrifice of Christianity on its own altars, but the intellect engaged in the defence of its truths is positively weakened and practically dishonoured. It is a tacit confession both of ignorance and imbecility to use such weapons. Logic and argument cannot dispense with feeling, but they are enfeebled by earthly passions. Selfish prejudices and morbid desires curse the mind whenever they are permitted to affect its operations. The lessons of material nature are never more eloquent than in those silent teachings that point out the firmament high above the world as the throne of light—a serene glory that the turbulent earth cannot interrupt. Nor does our planet hold the ascending clouds firm to its gravitation without an expressive symbol of the tranquil sanctity of that circling sky which dwells apart from the fellowship of things beneath. And yet Christianity is far nobler than these; it is God's image in thought and love—a perpetual witness of his moral majesty. Men must employ it as such, or its vigour and blessedness wither in their hands. If, indeed, the authority of Christianity as a revealed religion were to be set aside, and the intellect were merely to deal with it on the conditions of human art, it would be absolutely necessary to bring to its doctrines and precepts, a gentle, humble, loving temper; for in no other way could it act upon our instincts and quicken our comprehension. Wherever beauty, sentiment, truth in love, and truth in aspiration are to be embraced, the intellect must put off its earthliness, subdue its grosser passions, and rise into a purer atmosphere. It is the law of success in art no less than of obedience in religion; and hence we are sincerely gratified to find this volume conformed to such correct principles of taste as well as Christian virtue. The spirit of which we speak, may not of itself discover and exhibit the wonderful breadth and harmony of the gospel; but nevertheless, it is an invaluable power; for it does so order and arrange the action of the meditative mind, so discipline its faculties, so suggest the paths of heavenward inquiry, as to place it in the best possible position to acquire a sound and substantial and satisfactory knowledge of the wisdom of God. Let it even go beyond the limits of clearly-revealed truth and enter into the mystic realms of devout speculation, and there, amid the dim nebulæ of forming worlds, where chaos is repeating its ancient

struggles, and light is slowly evolving its drapery of splendour for the adornment of new spheres, it will trace the footsteps of Jehovah by the sure tokens of its own quick instinct.

Another feature of this volume is worthy of notice; it is written from the right point of survey. Believing that the doctrine of depravity, as held by evangelical Christians, is the doctrine of the Bible, and that the facts of experience are in perfect agreement with it, the writer endeavours to show the ground on which they meet and support each other. If one wishes to treat this subject properly, he must take such an attitude, for in no other can he embrace all its connexions. The statements of the Scriptures are authoritative and final; no appeal can be made from them. But they address our active faculties; they invoke attention, carefulness, and intelligence in our investigations; they put the working mind on its best processes and tax its profoundest skill. Every man is obliged to recognise his senses, experience, and consciousness in the study of the Bible, for these are constituents in his existence, and elements in all his calculations; and every man is equally bound to harmonize the facts of the one with the facts of the other. The relations of truth are parts of the truth itself, and hence the earthly and the divine aspects of Christianity are both to be estimated and felt.

We have, then, two classes of phenomena: side by side they are arranged before us. Revelation and reason—miracles and common facts—naturalism and supernaturalism—God above nature and God in nature—are in strange association. A system is developed, that emerges from mystery and enters on the clear, open field of human cognizance; it introduces itself among the most familiar objects of daily interest; it meets us in the street, in the marts of business and pursuits of knowledge, at the fireside, in the sanctuary, in all places and at all times; it never changes its tone, demeanour, symbols; it never abates its claims or compromises its sovereignty; and yet, amid all this freedom of intercourse, intent on ceaseless companionship with mortal men and conversant with their minutest concerns, it maintains its two-fold relation to earth and heaven; it is with God and with man at the same instant, in the same perfection. And in consequence of this singular position, our minds are brought into connexion with two worlds. The facts are apparently irreconcilable. But it is just here that the great work of intellect, awakened and cultivated by Christianity, is found. The discord is to be healed; the seemingness of contrariety is to be explained; disturbing forces are to be adjusted; and the new machinery, reducing the will of the race—the science of the race—the power of the race—into subjection to the authority of God, is to exhibit its beau-

tiful union with the universal system of moral government. It is man's task to ascertain and demonstrate this harmony between Christianity and the facts of his condition. Philosophy has no right to ask Christianity to explain this enigma. There is no reason why Christianity should undertake to do such a work; there is every reason against it. The only thing that it could rationally be expected to prove is its divine origin. If it furnish evidences of its heavenly birth; if it wear the robes and show the stamp of an unearthly royalty; if it speak the language of eternity and command the resources of infinity in authenticating its claims on the reverence, faith, and service of mankind, it has thoroughly exhausted all demands that sober reason can have. No sooner has this been accomplished than it takes its position among the common phenomena of the world, in so far as its connexions are involved, and the offices of intelligent science are then to be exercised in establishing its relations with other known and accepted truths. And precisely such is the method that God has ordained in the history of Christianity. Miracles were wrought to show the presence of omnipotence; to exhibit its alliance with those august and majestic forms of power that everywhere signalize the material universe; to arouse the mind by its sensibility to exceptional instances of wonder and amazement, and to fasten its sublimities deeply in that sense of mystery, of nearness to a surrounding awe, of involuntary sympathy with whatever transcends the limits of human measurement, which is so active a sentiment in our constitution. On this external proof Christianity was founded. Its title to a place in the phenomena of the universe was thus made good; its location was determined; its *paternity* was put beyond all doubt. If, now, in this primeval period of Christianity, an inquiring intellect should be suddenly thrown on the profound moral sentiments of its creed, how would it act? Suppose that some mighty grief, cleaving its affectionate nature as with a lightning shaft, should reveal a hitherto undreamed depth of tenderness and love, or any other summons, like a blast from a distant sphere, should intensify its sense of affliction and transform the whole universe into a symbol of woe; it is obvious that its Christian sentiments would receive a terrible shock. And why? Because its taste, feeling, and hopes, had just before been vivified and elevated by the cardinal idea of *goodness* in the governing authority of the world *without any adverse experience to counterbalance the primary emotion.* But in a healthy state of the mental faculties, it would soon recover itself, and a *counterpoise*, springing from the play of interacting elements that did not previously exist, would be established. Such a mind would have the fresh recollection of mir-

acles to restore its equanimity. It would have a great fact—one that came to it with more pomp and significance than anything in its earlier history—to lift itself up before its wavering faith and silence its anxious questionings.

But let us imagine a different state of things; let us take the man of our day. There is a distance of nineteen centuries between him and the miracles which were displayed in the East, for the attestation of Christianity; but, nevertheless, they are evidences for him. A wonderful literature, contained in a single book, pregnant with every form of earnest and inspiring life, confirmed by numerous outward incidents, and holding a scarcely disputed mastery over all that is elsewhere magnificent in thought, preserves the testimony of those who were the chosen witnesses of these signal events. And yet assurance is still further strengthened. For the existence of Christianity in a hostile world—a foreign power, creating its own hospitality, and receiving no friendship that it does not originate and keep alive—is the daily repeated miracle of his observation. Now, it must be apparent, that such a man will be exposed to his peculiar temptations, growing out of the circumstances of his position. If there be any debate in his mind, it will be on the ground of reconciling Christianity with the facts of experience and consciousness. The cause of the struggle may, probably, be explained. The constant tendency of Christian experience is to withdraw its subject from the outward world—to weaken the dominion of the senses—to familiarize him with spiritual conceptions—to secure a firm and cordial sympathy with those objects that derive the grandeur of a transcendent importance and the charm of a most attractive loveliness from the interests of eternity. And by these means, as the processes of inward life are continued, there is a steady enhancement of consciousness, a vigorous quickening of individual relations to the divine economy. One would not think that this cultivation of consciousness would involve danger. But the deep insight that it gives into the soul; the lofty aspirations it excites; the earnest strivings for the perfect mastery of its cherished sentiments that it maintains; the painful contrasts between the purity promised and attained, which are ever recurring in its meditative hours; and, above all, the frightful enigma of evil, following its progress, challenging its study, baffling its skill, and mocking even revelation itself, press sorely, heavily upon it. Hence, it would seem that the development of consciousness, raising man to a higher sense of his inheritance, renders him more sensitive to the mysterious facts of his existence. A passing breath of wind plays upon his heart-strings, and a portentous meaning comes from the strange

music; but if that breath had not proceeded from heaven, what more would it be than the idle zephyr of a summer eve?

The moral world must consequently be the battle-ground of Christianity. The great chord was struck when Nicodemus asked, "*How can these things be?*" A thousand times the heart repeats that memorable question—not only about the new birth, but in respect to every wonder with which Christianity makes it acquainted. The real problem of life is the reconciliation of Christianity with the phenomena of the moral world, and Providence devolves this task on us as the surest method to train us to the final comprehension of its purposes. Nowhere are there so many seeming contradictions—such sharply-defined inconsistencies of appearance—such unremitting warfare between light and darkness—such discordant elements—as here; and nowhere are there so many effective instruments to discipline us to the intelligence and virtue of Christian character. And how does Christianity propose to conduct this struggle? It distinctly asserts the incompetency of knowledge to settle the difficulty, and announces the partialness of its revelations as a fixed principle in its administration of human affairs. We "*know in part,*"—"*prophesy in part,*"—is its declaration. Where, then, are the compensations? Where are the operative forces, girded for the mighty achievement? "And now abideth faith, hope, charity—these three." A divine emphasis is laid on "*these three.*" And because of this law—the law of "*these three,*"—all the conflict and trial ensue. If in the place of faith we had the knowledge of reason—if for hope we had certain possession, and for charity, the higher forms of angelic love, the sources of perplexity and distress would be instantly removed. The nature of these principles evinces the painful strife to which the progressive mind, imbued with the spirit of Christianity, is doomed. Unbelief, despair, malignity—*these three*—are the mighty ministers of evil. *These three* are the emissaries of perdition; *these three* are the oily-tongued sophists and veiled deceivers of iniquity; *these three* are the shrewd speculators that wander on the shores of dark and stormy oceans, and throw the line into fathomless depths; *these three*—what allies of the tempter, what ruthless intruders into the sanctuary of sorrow, lighting the dim eye of grief with a wild glare, and adding a keener pang than bereavement to the anguish of a desolated heart! No wonder, therefore, that the moral world gives birth and scope to such a fiery contest; no wonder that unresting feet press its burning sands, and feeble nerves quiver in its terrible whirlwinds. The legions of heaven and hell meet on this field, and that combat which decides the results of the incarnation, life, death, resurrection, and

glorification of Jesus Christ, Mediator between God and man, and princely Head of the universe, is here conducted.

Our remarks on this point have been extended, because we believe that the indications of the age show a strong tendency to transfer the argument of Christianity to this ground. Infidelity can never gain any advantage from physical science: for, just in proportion as scientific truth advances, it is found that the human mind is advancing in the same line of movement with Christianity. The present forms of scepticism are generally marked by the traces of spiritual solicitude, which no art and ingenuity can disguise; and whatever may be the dangerous fascinations lurking in them, no man can mistake those violent revulsions of soul, that never fail to occur whenever the foundations of belief, solace, and strength are overthrown. Infidelity is ordinarily a reaction from the course on which Christianity is proceeding, and hence it is not difficult to read the progress of the one in the historic exhibitions of the other. The angles of the shadow must correspond with the angles of light; and as Christianity enters on any given portion of our diversified nature, it must provoke a counter struggle in the same department of thought and experience. Nor is this awakening of resistant forces limited to infidelity. The latent elements of unbelief, ready at any time and in any way to break forth in the partially sanctified Christian, are easily quickened by those modes of meditative inquiry which a cultivated period encourages. Materialism cannot disturb them. The difficulties of physical science arouse no doubts and fears. A single sublime sentiment, a moment of divine communion, a glimpse of the better glory, lifts them high above these mole-hills: for in such a debate, if debate it can be called, the spirit asserts its superiority to sense, and claims the security of its birthright. But it is otherwise when the soul is arrayed against itself. If instinct rebels against instinct, sentiment against sentiment, there is set up the most painful and perplexing warfare that the human mind can possibly undergo. We witness this spectacle in our day. And the reason is obvious. It is an age of earnest and general culture. It is an age of profound spiritual thought and anxious reflection. It is an age in which the reason of piety is more than ever considered, and the heart prefers its claims on the intellect. Signs are abounding that it is a transition age, in which devout men are passing from a religion of education to a religion of conviction—from forms to realities—from outward machinery to inward life; and consequently their faith must be subjected to new tests: for who can ascend the mountain without feeling the chill air and the encompassing cloud? Who expects not, that at intervals he will lose the fair

prospect and the ample horizon, as he toils upward to the summit of furthest vision and brightest sunlight?

The specific object of Mr. Mercein's book is to examine "*the facts of human life and consciousness*," in their relation to the Scripture doctrine of depravity. Taking the moral man, who discharges the duties of ethical propriety with a faithfulness, devotion, and beauty that must be acknowledged, and finding that he cannot enter into the meaning of those strong and vehement declarations of guilt and wickedness which abound in the Bible, he states fairly and fully the circumstances of his position—the difficulties, inseparable from character and condition, under which he labours in accepting the broad and unequivocal statements of inspiration—and the corresponding claim which he has on the intelligent forbearance of Christian sympathy. The first essay, on the "*Injustice done to Moral Men*," is an admirable presentation of the obstacles which prevent the moralist from appreciating the evil of his situation, and the influence which they ought to exert on our charity. The severe denunciation, in which so many writers and pulpits indulge, is justly condemned. The more philosophical and religious mode of treating this subject, as illustrated by Butler, Chalmers, M'Cosh, and others, is mentioned; and the necessity for careful discrimination, directing the shafts of discussion to the right point, is earnestly urged. The bearing of this essay is worthy of being thoroughly weighed: for to our mind it is perfectly clear, that the Church is not sufficiently sensible of the duties which it involves. There is a twofold reason for this appreciation of "moral men." If we ask ourselves the question, "Does Christianity sympathize with them?" there can be but one answer: It does feel for them. It takes account of their virtue, though it is earthly virtue; and while it regards them as sinners by nature and by practice, it nevertheless displays a considerate estimate of their character. Not that Christianity ever confounds this type of worldly excellence with the fruits of genuine religion, or even intimates that it is the vanishing line of a divine portraiture; but it is viewed in its own connexions and recognised on its own grounds. If such men were not the occupants of a redeemed sphere; if no Providence were over them; if the institutions of a refined and graceful civilization were not continually acting on their tastes, sentiments, and habits; in a word, if none of the indirect and secondary agencies of Christianity were operating on their minds, they would be utterly powerless on the score of social morality. Can any one suppose that Christianity would discredit any portion of its work? If it has diffused its serene and mighty influence through the economy of Providence, penetrated physical law, affected hereditary

dispositions, watched over the infant in its cradle, the youth at his sports, and the man in the commerce of the city, it is surely not the suicidal system that would dishonour its own gifts, and brand contemptuously its own favours. Admit these facts, and both interest and duty are plain. The more vital and intimate our sympathies are with Christianity, the greater degree of intellectual and spiritual strength will be produced: and especially will our social power be augmented. If we rendered justice to "moral men," it would have a good effect on them, for it would, in most instances, relieve them of an antagonistic attitude; they would cease to defend themselves: and thus freed from the supposed necessity of a constant war of resistance, they would be better prepared for the impressions of the gospel. And certain are we, that if the pulpit were more considerate of natural virtue, it would be far more effective in its rebukes of vice. The interests of Christianity are now suffering in the most serious manner, because of the inability of the Church to extend her sway over "moral men;" and we know not how the growing evil is to be remedied but by the introduction of a wiser philosophy and a truer courtesy in our conduct toward them.

The second essay, on the "*Unconsciousness of Deep Guilt,*" is one of the clearest, strongest essays that we have ever read. Apart from everything else in this thoughtful and suggestive volume, it has a definiteness, a pungency, a force in its reasoning, that would give Mr. Mercein a high position as a moral writer. There are some golden paragraphs in this portion of the work, to which any one who has read them will be glad to recur in his most receptive moments. The more formal and logical parts of the argument are exceedingly well expressed, while the illustrated branches of it are really glowing with genius. The object of the essay is to show, that the general unconsciousness of deep guilt affords no presumption against the doctrine of utter depravity. Scripture seems to exhaust language in representing the natural condition of man. The boldest statements, the most ample variety of diction, the most scathing rebukes, the aptest figures run through every form that literature can assume. It is expounded in didactic instruction, and conveyed in poetic imagery. Biography, narrative, history, song, prayers, praise, sermons, exhortations, letters, visions, prophecies, are full of this mighty burden of the heart and thought of Scripture. Nor is this all. The external universe is a vast whispering gallery, where voices of wretchedness and woe, breathing forth in silence and solitude their melancholy wail, are evermore repeated; and as the tones return, there springs a deeper sense of the gigantic misery which has everywhere seized the world as its inheritance. And yet, the unregen-

erated man does not respond to the divine utterance of his guilt. The severe declarations of Scripture are not attested by ordinary experience. Guilt is treated as a fact, as a prominent fact, as a most affecting fact, in God's world; but men refuse to admit and feel it. Why? The same cause that creates guilt, creates insensibility, and, therefore, according to our present constitution, depravity is as consistent with unconsciousness as innocence itself. The simple fact is, that consciousness in all Christian relations has to be awakened and cultivated by divine grace, and hence it is a fatal folly to trust its spontaneous dictates. Like the rest of our nature, it has sunk under the spell of carnal slumber—the sleep of death is there; and only the voice of God can rouse it to life. But Mr. Mercein advances a step further. The consequences of sin are mercifully hidden from us in this world; remorse is held in abeyance; the flaming eye is veiled, lest the full perception of our transgressions and their demerits should utterly and forever overwhelm us. Probation demands this condition of mind. Mr. Mercein is correct in this view. For moral motives to be motives—*such motives as Christianity employs*—there must be a careful limitation to the circumstances and organization of man. Such an excess of action on the sensibilities of our nature as any other theory would imply, could only result in the introduction of force into the realm of intellectual and spiritual life. If every act of iniquity were to flame out its frightful features against the calm sky; if, indeed, the countenance were to picture, like the painting of the sunbeam, the moral physiognomy of the soul; if, in a word, men were to be made fully aware of the awaiting punishment—the conditions of appeal, entreaty, volition, would be radically changed. The facts of the gospel might be called "*motives*," but in no proper sense, for their power would be so intense, so subduing, so irresistible, as to establish the reign of fatalism. Heaven, therefore, follows the law of reserve. It offers sufficient reasons for repentance, faith, and holiness. It makes Christian culture attractive and ennobling. It proclaims the approaching judgment, and points the wicked to their awful destiny. But in all this, the most studied respect for the organic processes of the mind is observed. No courtly ceremonial could be more rigid and exact. Not only is our planetary home insulated from proximity to other orbs, but the message that reaches it from the throne of the Eternal is characterized by a wise deference to the circumstances and provisions of our being.

The next essay proceeds to consider another presumption, which men are disposed to indulge. It is the presumption against the idea of deep guilt, afforded by God's temporal blessings upon

natural virtue. Mr. Mercein admits, that the mind intuitively connects holiness and happiness. Nor can this be doubted; for the two are correlatives. The idea of the one is incomplete without the other. But are the temporal rewards of morality the "Inspector's brand, marking its soundness?" They are not; and Mr. Mercein proceeds to show that these consequences do not evince the moral character of the agent. Men practise these different moralities and are rewarded for them, but it is impossible to reduce them to any system. The reason is apparent: no common principle underlies them. A man may be virtuous in one of these relations and vicious in another; and thus he may be blest in the former and cursed in the latter. So much obedience—so much recompense—is the decree, that daily life executes. It is analogous to physical law. A man may obey the law of gravitation, but could he argue from this fact that the lightning would not strike him? Let him guard his stomach from intemperance and gluttony; let him attend to its health; and a certain good result will follow: but it would be sheer folly to dream that this regimen would prevent the dust from inflaming his eyes, or an undue exposure to cold from irritating his lungs. Mr. Mercein has not pressed this argument as far as it would bear, nor is its full force brought out as effectively as it might have been. The moralities of life are matters of temporary relations rather than of permanent principles, and hence they take their place among the same arrangements that reward the agriculturist or the mechanic. We work and are supported; we sow the seed and reap the harvest; we act honestly and are trusted; we love and are loved in return; we perform a magnanimous deed and the community honours it. The world is constituted on this plan. Its conservative and socializing agencies are impregnated with this sentiment, and if it were set aside, the whole organization would crumble into nothingness. Viewed in a strictly philosophic light, it is a mere economic temporality—a regency rather than the higher form of government. If these moralities could be combined into a system, then a common sentiment, a common spirit, would animate them, and, as a necessary result, the development would be uniform, regular, and consistent. A good father would make a good neighbour, a good citizen, a good philanthropist, a good merchant, a good banker, or any other good. And why? Because character would be exercised and matured *as character*. The springs of inward life would be reached and the fundamental nature would be rectified. But such is not experience and observation. The moral law of Christianity can be summed up in love to God and love to man; love is the synonyme of all the commandments; but the worldly

moralities that adorn life are incapable of any such abbreviation so long as they are contemplated as mere moralities. Each one for itself—each one in its own distinctiveness—each one in its own place—must be set down in the formula, and by no possibility can the worth of one be transferred to the account of the other.

The aim of Mr. Mercein is to show just here, that the earthly moralities, whatever may be their utility and beauty in the present arrangements of life, cannot involve the higher and purer morality of the gospel. Their rewards offer no pledge of its reward. "When these earthly rewards," says he, page 76, "and their virtuous acts and the relationships which called them forth have passed away, the question of *eternal morality* and *eternal rewards* will stand, as it does to-day—alone—to be determined by its own evidences." Hence, he comes to the conclusion, that "*whatever the temporal blessing and curse which attend human action may indicate, it certainly does not indicate any such regard for the moralist as shall secure him from eternal punishment in the future world.*" And this conclusion is supported by the fact, that God bestows his benediction on actions in this world simply as actions, and without any respect to motives. Imperfect as this scheme of recompense is, it nevertheless serves to express the moral relations of God as the Governor of the world, and to intimate the duties and prospects of mankind.

The progress of the argument through the fourth essay is to examine the presumption against the idea of deep guilt which is afforded by the comparative rectitude of human conduct. The secondary motives to morality, derived from prudential considerations, and their effective action in the existing economy of nature, are most admirably unfolded. There is in this section of the work not only a great deal of logical power, but an unusual degree of subtle and minute force. Nowhere is the steady hand—the exact eye—of the marksman more distinctly visible. The embroidered veil is lifted from the moral world, and its deceptive anatomy is laid bare. No heart, touched by the plastic finger of Heaven, is here,—no desires, burning for their native sphere,—no aspirations, ascending with humble prayer as the fragrant incense rises with the smoke of the sacrifice. But the reader must not suppose that these inducements, flowing from a wise regard to interest and welfare, are depreciated. Far from it. If a man will not surrender his spirit to the play of the select and sanctified motives of Christianity, he acts well in not abandoning humbler incitements. "If he is *not* a saint, it is honourable not to be a fool." Now this is certainly the correct view of the case. Men cannot live in society

without feeling the pressure of social necessities. A thousand ties bind them to a thousand objects. The strings of the human heart —what a net-work are they, spreading out and abroad over myriads of things, connexions, purposes, aims, ambitions, and projects, embracing land and sea, island and continent—intertwined with the wealth of the mine and the harvest of the field—and laced around country, neighbourhood, and home! What urgent and pathetic calls to sobriety, honesty, uprightness, in the love of the fireside and the responsibilities of wedded life! What sermons for every week-day on the nobleness of work, when nature spreads her sacrament beneath the encircling sky, and pledges her sunshine, rain, and dew to compensate the industry of muscle and nerve! Amid these gorgeous scenes, bearing still the beautiful tracery of a purer age, where the memory of Eden is casketed in gold and jewelry, where the busy light wreathes its silver drapery for unseen forms of matchless grace, where the heavens and the earth meet in sweet embrace and repeat as of old the nuptials of their birth; amid these scenes, where God yet walks and gives to our listening ears the echo of his footsteps if not the precious salutations of his voice; amid these scenes, where Christianity emblazons its symbols wide over the firmament and across every teeming landscape,—where the whitening harvests, and the bending lilies, and the soaring birds all recall the image of Christ; amid such scenes, sacred by their memorials, their prophecies, and their joys, how could *men* live and not be mellowed and moved! Not parsimonious is that hand which has multiplied its benefactions here. Heaven has its selecter and more glorious splendours; earth has its lesser charms. The cursed world is not deprived of all its resources. It is God's "*footstool*,"—worthy of being so much a portion of his throne. The benefits of intelligence, truth, and love—the institutions of refined civilization —the diffusive mercies of Christianity—are all here in rich profusion. And they must operate through every channel of human existence. Whether recognised or not, they must obey their inherent law and exert a meliorating influence over mankind. Insensibly, silently, calmly, they find their way to hearts that own them not. A reflected light, such as the moon gives from the sun, is distributed from their thoughts, sentiments, affections, and conduct.

It is easy to see, then, that there is a provision for "*comparative rectitude*" in the present economy of nature and providence—a system of life, enterprise, and sensibility, outside of Christianity, in which all prudential motives, all shapes of personal and relative emotion, may be intensely active. Such a "rectitude" has a

name—a *status*—a vitality that cannot be disputed or denied. Fear and pride are its most common constituents. It lacks the cardinal and central element of Christianity—love to God and man—and hence, whatever else it may be, it is not religion. However far it may remove a human being from a demon, it does not bring him to the companionship of an angel. "Social instinct" cannot be viewed as a "moral perception," and motives that consult general expediency, and circulate only within the narrow circle of immediate, tangible, remunerative interests, are not such motives as can sustain the spirit in its heavenward flight.

Passing to the succeeding essay, (No. V,) Mr. Mercein elaborates the beauty, gracefulness, and service of the "*natural virtues*." There is an eloquence here that is both attractive and forcible. Passages there are of gentle picturesqueness—like valley-landscapes set within mountain-enclosures—and passages too of great warmth and throbbing heartiness. A full, cordial, and cheerful acknowledgment of the numerous and gratifying offices of the "*natural virtues*" is made: the spontaneous and disinterested impulses are duly credited with all their sublime exhibitions, and their presence in benevolent institutions, literature, and other commanding forms, is honourably and gladly appreciated. Aware that these excellences have been made the theme of abuse and reproach, the author seems to be anxious to award them the fullest share of justice; and his tribute, dictated by a truthful and generous heart, is eminently successful. The charge of the distinguished Dr. Channing, that a rigid orthodoxy has often "exaggerated the sins of men, that the need of an infinite atonement may be maintained," is felt, and the author labours to put himself beyond its application. How, then, are these "*natural virtues*" to be managed—where are they to be located—and what are their final issues? The view presented by the celebrated Dr. Chalmers, in which the claims of God are brought before "*the complacent moralist*," and he is made to realize his spiritual bankruptcy, no matter how well he has discharged his duty to man, is introduced and examined. A brief extract from Dr. Dewey, with a sensible criticism, is given. "The very nature of true excellence," says Dr. Dewey, "in one form is a pledge for its existence in every other form." Mr. Mercein turns the principle back upon the doctor with decided skill. The very nature of true excellence in *one* form being a pledge for its existence in *every other* form, then, of course, "its absence, unregretted, unresisted in any form, argues its absence in every other form, whatever there may be of its *semblance*." The point is well stated. Standing then on this ground, without a direct appeal to a consciousness

of neglect or enmity toward God, Mr. Mercein finds that the "*natural virtues*" are deficient in a central principle, and hence are wanting in the "symmetry, regularity, and uniformity" which attend a true love of rectitude.

The field seems now to be cleared. The sixth essay comes to the "*Relation of Morality to Religion.*" It is the most masterly section of the volume. For clear, compressed, consecutive thought—for arguments that move and march in lustre—for breadth and compass of outline—for apt, striking, felicitous illustrations—and above all, for concentration on the single point in contemplation, we shall not hesitate to express our warm admiration for this brilliant and profound essay. It indicates a thinker of extraordinary acuteness and grasp—a man of abstract and generalizing power, who is capable of ascending above the mediocre levels of religious meditation, and taking large and original views of his theme. The idea which Mr. Mercein elaborates, is, that "*some preliminary steps are requisite*" before any practicable offer of salvation can be presented. To a certain extent, the sensibilities of the mind must be restrained; the idea of sin must be *toned down* to the degree demanded by the tranquil working of thought and emotion; the "violence, the sweep, the frenzy of passion" must be checked; in brief, a repressive force is to be exerted on *passion* equally with the *sense of guilt, shame, and danger*. The mind is thus put in *a probationary position*. But what then? The soul is destitute of pure affections; how is it to be trained to appreciate excellence? How are ideas to be communicated, emotions excited, aspirations enkindled? If the soul cannot, says Mr. M., "have virtuous affections, *it must be impressed with parallel instincts.*" The conclusion is therefore reached, that "a fair platform for further operations may be obtained by these three measures: a deadened consciousness of guilt, repressed passion, and the affectional instincts. *These instincts, supported by the systems of rewards and punishments administered in this life, would preserve a true probationary condition.*"

Had we space, it would afford us pleasure to extend our examination of this theory of the "*relation of morality to religion.*" We must content ourselves with a few general observations.

First, then, it may be remarked, that the view advocated by Mr. Mercein, locates morality in the natural world. Its virtues are regarded as a sort of *outfit* for the duties of earthly life, in the immediate sphere of its appetites, tastes, desires, actions. It is the archetype—the original pattern—on which the present fallen social state is organized. It is the idea out of which friendship, home, philanthropy has grown. It is the moral capital of business,

industry, enterprise. Taken in this connexion, it is a part of the vast system of Divine Providence for the government of the human race, varied from its other forms so as to suit the wants of a rational being, and direct his agency toward the attainment of the benignant ends of Infinite Wisdom. *Secondly.* Morality points to a higher economy. Operating through the intellect, it suggests purer thoughts than it can realize; through the will, a need of strength and purpose it cannot attain; through the affectional instincts, a fuller experience of beauty, trust, and joy, than its own objects can supply. Its tendency, if not interrupted, would be to educate man to look for something beyond itself, and by means of the influence exerted on it, to stimulate him to seek it. In brief, it is a practical institute of types and adumbrations, foreshadowing every moment, and in all its manifestations, the divine remedy for its own weaknesses and guilt. *Thirdly.* Christianity avails itself of this providential instrumentality to effect its own specific work. It adopts its sentiments and offices as illustrations of its plan and regimen. Words that primarily belong to its relations are adopted into its vocabulary, and feelings that interchange between man and his fellow are purified and transferred to new claimants. The direct purposes which morality subserves are temporary and mundane; but it has a further and a nobler capability. When its immediate ends are reached, these ends may become means to a still ulterior purpose.

It strikes us that there is a great deal of discrimination and force in Mr. Mercein's views. One of the difficult points in theology is to define the exact position of the "*natural virtues.*" A stern and severe orthodoxy frequently hands them over, in a mass, to Satan, and treats them as nothing more than his splendid disguises. They are supposed to be worse than valueless in the sight of God. Positive counterfeits of the true currency, they only suffice to purchase damnation by a most costly investment, giving scorpions for eggs, stones for bread, in this world, and terminating in the worst of bankruptcy in a future state. One extreme provokes another. Disgusted with this roll of infamy, in which the "*natural virtues*" are registered, a latitudinarian theology, claiming to be liberal by special distinction, seizes the tablets of heaven, and records these "*virtues*" in bewitching loveliness on their spotless marble. According to its theory, human nature is not essentially and radically depraved. It labours under an oppressive weakness; but the principle of moral health, perpetuated from our original creation and designed to be a constitutional element of the immortal mind, has been preserved. The aid of divine grace is not rejected. Watchfulness and prayer, self-denial and self-sacrifice, are held to be necessary. But, never-

theless, religion is a mere outgrowth from a native germ; all that Christianity does is to create a genial climate, to give the brightest sunshine and the most fertilizing dews for the stimulation of its fibres and juices. If, now, a cultivated Christian mind, divesting itself of all partisanship, contemplate these two systems in the ordinary forms, which they present it cannot be insensible to the fact that they both appeal to certain sentiments in its nature. Orthodoxy may be rigid; it may sometimes extend to harshness; but there is a power in its doctrines, a pungency in its appeals, a pointedness in its dealings that must be acknowledged. Sin and guilt, driven from paradise, and doomed to the trials of toil and the tears of tribulation; shrieking in the fast-ascending waters of the deluge, and shivering before the terrors of Sinai; enacting their tragedies of woe in every age, and fraternizing with hell and ruin; erecting splendid temples to Satan, defying God, crucifying Christ; such sin and guilt stand out before its eye. It feels the awful moral of the scene. Not with words of courteous compromise, nor with parlour-etiquette, can it deal with the gigantic evil. Men are perishing. The heart of Christ was pierced for them—shall they pierce themselves through with sorrows that eternity cannot assuage? The blood of the Lamb of God—the only Lamb in the fold of the universe—was shed for them; and shall they float away from the cross on a deluge of their own blood and plunge into perdition? No wonder, then, that it is so earnest, so emphatic, so intensely excited in muscle, nerve, heart, and brain! The danger warrants it—the danger inspires it; and whatever may be thought of its occasional violations of good taste, its fiery zeal, its persistent purpose, its unyielding exactions, one thing is certain, and that is, it grapples mightily with the profoundest sympathies and strongest sentiments of our nature, and comes home, with terrible vehemence, to whatever in us takes hold on the impressive realities of eternity.

But turn to another picture. "*Liberal Christianity*," as its friends term it, adopts another style of argument and appeal. It speaks to man as the child of misfortune. The accidents of education and example have misled ~~him.~~ A wanderer from the right way, a voluntary exile from goodness and love, he is cast abroad among temptations that often subjugate his native independence. It is a dark world, a sad world, a sinning world: but does not our *planet* belong to the same system as the SUN? Moral agency exists under disadvantages, and Christianity has been sent to strengthen and expand it. The element of competency is in us, but it requires a favourable combination of means and circumstances for its development. Christianity mainly supplies the want. It is the divine helper—the

gracious sympathizer—the heavenly benefactor. Regeneration, in the sense of a new creation, is not taught. It has faith; but it is simple confidence in the paternal goodness of God. It has repentance; but not such grief for sin, not such scalding tears as come from the vivid apprehension of a sacrificial death for a redemption from the bondage of iniquity. It binds man to a strict accountability, and demands of him a beautiful, thorough, earnest "*self-culture*" that shall make him worthy of his sovereignty over this lower world, and vindicate his title to the "*image of God.*" Such is our imperfect outline of "*liberal Christianity.*" If it has any errors, we hope to be forgiven. Just thinking is the crown of intellectual excellence, and on no account would we invade its claims.

That "*liberal Christianity*" addresses a certain order of sentiments within us cannot be doubted. If any refined and generous mind can calmly study the religious system of William Ellery Channing and Orville Dewey without feeling that it touches several sides of his nature, we envy neither his piety nor his wisdom. "*Liberal Christianity*" has made a truthful, eloquent, indignant protest against various forms of popular ignorance and religious passion. It has offered a vigorous resistance to Calvinism on the score of moral philosophy. It has defended the freedom of man. The social relations of Jesus Christ as a perfect man; the great duty of cherishing his serene spirit and imitating his illustrious example; the claims of humanity and philanthropy as religious considerations; the obligations of "self-culture;" the minor morals of Christianity, which are so often disregarded; the spiritual connexions of literature, science, and art, it has stated, amplified, illustrated, and enforced with remarkable clearness, beauty, and force. For this work it deserves our gratitude. Any man of thoughtful habits must see that these departments of religious intellect—these far-spreading fields of scholarship, taste, and elegance—have been shamefully neglected by orthodoxy. The mind of the Church has been engaged in unfolding Christianity as a transaction between God and man, and, particularly for the last century, the greater part of pulpit talent and lay ability has been occupied with this aspect of the system. But who can doubt that, meanwhile, Christianity, as a social law and a social life, has been strangely thrown into the background? The moon turns but one side of her orb to the earth; but is that the symbol of Christ's religion? The sense of ideality is a true element of the intellect. Not in vain have the fair and graceful forms of the material universe been created; not in vain have the stars kindled a festal splendour, and the landscape been robed in a beautiful livery. All these things are far deeper than eye and ear.

Poetry cannot satisfy the claims of this universe for expression. There are sights it cannot see, sounds it cannot hear. It cannot put a soul into the vast mysteries rising, swelling, darkening, all around us. Never! Creation—its magnificence, glory, terror—are closed to every creature. Its profoundest meanings are sure to escape us. Its most godlike emblems are the first to elude our search. But the universe exists for Christ. It was made *for* him as well as by him; and Christianity is his sole representative to interpret the wonders crowding the heavens and the earth. It only can use them so as to insure Christian instruction and pleasure, and render them an illuminated commentary on the page of Holy Scripture. The same remark applies to all the relations of Christianity to the affections of daily life. Here are these select ministers of earth's hallowed courts, anointed for pleasant and useful service, waiting the call of any token, glad to anticipate a wish or to suppress a half-uttered sigh; but Christianity has too often been suffered to withhold its influence and refuse its benediction. Men have not been taught, as they should have been, what a wealth of beauty and joy lay around them. Imagination has not been invited to the feast of munificence which the divine hand has spread on its royal boards, and sensibility has been left to seek its bliss where best it could find sympathy and cheer. And yet more. The law of labour, the toils of business, the enterprises of commerce have not been appreciated as means of moral and Christian education; nor, indeed, has the machinery of society been made to revolve with those "wheels within wheels" which sweep before us in the visions of prophecy. Orthodox Christianity has limited its field too much, and hence a *speciality* has been provoked into existence.

Let us not be misunderstood. We prefer no charges against orthodox Christianity on the score of earnest sincerity, sound doctrine, pure morals. It has witnessed a good confession. It has translated the ritual of heaven into the language of childhood, youth, and age. It has taught jurisprudence its wisdom, and government its creed. It has proclaimed the cross far and wide as the only hope, the sufficient hope, of the world. A ministration of power and purity, a co-worker with the Holy Ghost, it has borne a saving testimony to the majestic truths that are embodied in the New Testament. The precise point is this, viz.: The individual relations of Christianity to the higher forms of earthly sentiment and personal culture—its authority in literature, art, business, and intercourse—its bearings on the great out-door realities of practical existence—have been too much omitted; and in this way another system has been developed into life and activity. "*Liberal Christianity*" has

undertaken to supply this felt deficiency. It has summoned men to consider the authority of reason; emphasized the strength, loveliness, and honour of sensibility; elevated the affections of home, kindred, and race; dwelt on the capacities of mind, and carried agency through all the wide circuit of endeavour, struggle, suffering, and heroism. Had we to contemplate it in these aspects alone, it would win our warmest admiration and call forth our most cordial greeting. But the religious idea of the system—its provisions for a fallen, ruined, guilty race—will press themselves on our attention. *Here,* we feel its utter feebleness. Here, its pretensions stagger confidence in its most amiable moods. Here, we are unable to resist the oppressive thought, that it has forsaken the central seat of Zion and occupied a remote hill-top on the outskirts of the world's province. Here, in a word, our consciousness assures us, that it does not represent Christ where Christ most truly and fully revealed himself—in the garden of Gethsemane, on the cross of Calvary, on the mount of heavenly intercession.

The history of "*liberal Christianity*" throws light on these suggestions. We speak particularly of its history in New-England. Commencing as a reaction against the Puritan theology, resisting its supposed exclusiveness, harshness, and bigotry, and demanding a freer atmosphere, a broader horizon, and a more genial companionship, it went forth mildly but boldly into the realm of intellectual and speculative inquiry; it accepted the Bible as God's book, and its interpretation of Christianity as God's religion. Believing in the necessity of a divine manifestation, it received Christ as the great teacher and inspired example to the human race. It did not set aside the supernatural element in Christianity, but acknowledged the miracles wrought in attestation of its claims, and preached the operation of a heavenly influence to assist the struggles of our frail nature. The sanctity of private reason and the injunctions of Catholic charity, were brought out in special prominence. It was the champion of free-will, free-thought, free-utterance—the firm opponent of creeds and dogmas; it was jealous of associations and combinations, lest they should fetter the individual, and monopolize the influences of the age; no stranger to the woes of humanity, it cherished a tender sympathy with human sorrow, and offered its balm to bleeding hearts; the degradations of the race awakened its philanthropy, and stirred its deepest sensibilities. Poverty and nakedness, ignorance and crime, misfortune and calamity, were more than spectral shapes moving in wild dismay and savage fury before it. Dread realities were they on which the sunshine of God lay pale and lustreless. And then, beside these, but in a lower wretchedness,

the spiritual nature, so forgetful of its princely birth, so unfaithful to all its better instincts, so heedless of the myriad voices calling it to high communion, so sunk in oft-occurring bestiality, moved its emotions to interceding prayer and eager effort. It chose its modes and means of action. Endowed with intellect not surpassed; enriched with learning, scholarship, and literary arts; alive with Anglo-Saxon blood, and proud of Anglo-Saxon traditions, it entered the pulpit, employed the press, discoursed at the fireside, and brought all other honourable instrumentalities into its service. No experiment was ever tried under more propitious circumstances. Its dissent shut it out from no offices of place and power. It was under no state ban. The field was wide open; it could have the whole sweep of the horizon and multiply converts in any direction. If, now, any system, rejecting the divinity of Jesus Christ, the doctrine of a vicarious sacrifice, and the work of the Holy Ghost in renewing our fallen and helpless nature, could reach the heart and reform the world, it was New-England Unitarianism, for *it* was Unitarianism in its most attractive and effective form. The repulsive features of English and Continental Unitarianism were softened down to the utmost extent of which the distinctive tenets were capable, and apart from that, a class of persons became its adherents and disciples in our country, whose tastes, habits, and circumstances would correct, as far as practicable, the excesses of the system. And what have been the results? A few of its advocates have reached the border-land of infidelity. Numbers have welcomed Transcendentalism and its egregious follies; idealism, speculation, and extravagance have misled others. But, confining our view to those who still represent original Unitarianism, what tidings do they offer of its strength, progress, prospects? A careful study of its movements and effects cannot fail to demonstrate that it is a feeble religious creed. It has no centrality—no staminal trunk, out of which the various branches can grow; it has no ground of Christian sympathy. Brotherhood is one of its favourite sentiments; but this is such a general principle, diffused over so large a surface, and supported by such inadequate motives, as to be a practical nullity. Cordial Christian union—fraternal feeling, as begotten by a common interest in Jesus Christ, and the constant habit of dwelling on the same object and with the same associations—is unknown to it. In aggressiveness it is equally lacking. To push its way among the haunts of men, to storm the battlements of hoary corruption, to gain trophies from the very vicinage of hell are, apparently, beyond its scope. It has laid a decided stress on insight, and yet, strange to tell, no literature is so deficient in penetrating the soul, tracing its dark

labyrinths, exposing its endless mazes, and forcing its darling delusions out into the glare of the sunshine. Insight! What is there in all the compass of its rich and diversified literature to compare with the microscopic eye of John Bunyan; the deep, silent, earnest search of Philip Doddridge; the philosophic penetrativeness of Jonathan Edwards? If these are facts, then, what is the lesson of "*liberal Christianity?*" It seems to us that it proves the absolute impossibility of reducing Christianity to the conditions of art. It furnishes the most convincing evidence that "*Christ crucified*" is by the laws of philosophy, by the instincts of the soul, as well as by the provisions of the gospel, the only doctrine that can humble human pride, teach human reason, rouse conscience, change the heart, and regenerate society. But is this all? No; it teaches another lesson: it delivers a message to orthodox Christianity; it instructs us that the beautiful, the tender, the truthful, the noble in our nature are not to be neglected or despised.

No middle ground is wanted; the foundations of Christianity cannot be changed. "*Christ crucified*" must be preached; without it there is no hope, no pardon, no peace. The view of "*natural virtues,*" presented by "*liberal Christianity,*" cannot be incorporated into Christianity as we hold it, for that view entitles them to the rank of dormant religious germs, awaiting the process of mere development and superseding the necessity of a regenerating work of grace. But, nevertheless, a great advance in the conceptions of evangelical persons, and especially in the temper of their minds on this subject, would be effected, if the hand of the Divine Husbandman were traced in the growth and cultivation of these "*virtues.*" Justice to these "*virtues*" does not require them to be recognised as the incipient principles of vital religion, nor, on the other hand, does it bind us to treat them as the offspring of Satan. The essential elements of heaven and hell do not appear in those sensibilities out of which the beautiful forms of social humanity spring. First of all, therefore, the distinction is to be broadly laid down between the social nature and the moral nature of man, in regard to the law of responsibility, and the awards of the final judgment. If that is clearly apprehended, the next point is to consider the "*natural virtues*" in their relation to the plan of redemption. *Are they connected with the mediatorial economy?* The fact seems to be indisputable. They exist in the human heart because Jesus Christ died; they are a portion of the benefits of his assumption of our guilt: they are under the care of Heaven, for purposes ulterior to themselves. The whole system of earthly providence is founded on them, and by means of their operations conscience is awakened to

see the need of a divine guidance, infirmity is taught to seek the aid of Christ, self-righteousness is convicted of folly and guilt, and salvation by faith in the atonement is revealed to the heart. Such views practically tend to enhance the power of Christianity in our hands. The strength of rebuke—that mighty agent in the minister of the sanctuary—is left untouched, and its loyalty to the commission from above is maintained in undiminished vigour. Sympathy is likewise encouraged. A gentle, tender, affectionate spirit, finding so much amid the ruins of human nature to gladden its eye and cheer its hopes, deepens the fervours of entreaty and inspires the eloquence that beseeches men to be reconciled to God.

On the one side, decision is guarded from the extreme of dogmatism and malignity; on the other, charity is preserved from laxity and weakness. In brief, it impresses us that the line of thought adopted and enforced by Mr. Mercein is admirably fitted to define the boundaries of morality and religion—to relieve these subjects of much of their perplexity, and make them more tangible to certain orders of thinkers. No greater service can now be rendered to truth, than to give distinctness and boldness to its features—to present its substance in a sharp and angular manner—to limit it with exact justice to its own ground by preventing its encroachment on foreign soil. Whoever brings out obscure ideas into full relief, and teaches us the precise bearings of their foundations and forms, confers a great benefit on the highest interests of science. It is not the most showy and splendid sort of originality; so, at least, the world thinks; but, in our estimation, men of this class, searching among the approved verities of familiar meditations, clearing away their false incidents, and unfolding the entire complement of their relations, are worthy of the lofty praise of intellectual benefactors.

The remaining essays in the volume are devoted to the consideration of the religious principle in man, the process of conviction, repentance, faith, and kindred topics. All of them present the strong characteristics of an earnest, logical, forcible mind.

The observations on self-culture, in connexion with religious experience, are exceedingly sensible; but we wish that they had been extended. We have long been satisfied that there is a serious defect in our preaching and literature on this subject. The time has come for Methodism to pay more attention to its duties and means; it has given special significance to the supernatural element in Christianity, and urged with uncommon ability the cardinal doctrine of the Holy Ghost's influence. Not the slightest abatement of this supreme truth do we wish to see; but rather, as time advances, and the Church expands her field, let it be exhibited

with increasing zeal. The genuine idea of self-culture accompanies this divine agency. Religion, as a constant education, as ministered to by all the offices of daily life, as the universal absorbent that is to draw upon everything with which we come in contact,—religion every moment, everywhere, in every connexion, is the urgent want of the times. Few there are who continually feel that the charms of home, the pleasures of friendship, the grace of intercourse, the meetings on the street, the commerce of business, the thousand objects acting on us, are the materials of Christian spirituality. Who think of the lessons of Heaven written all over this wide-spread world? Who realize that the beauty of childhood, the endearments of filial love, the oneness of marriage, the greetings of the market-place, the honours of confidence, and the other experiences of earthly history are instruments to promote our growth and strength? The whole system of creation and providence ought to be classed under "*means of grace.*" And the reason is obvious: personal Christianity has its earthly side as well as its heavenly side; prayer and praise, sanctuary service and sacraments, Scripture and meditation,—these are inseparably identified with all the emotions of the heart in their worship of the Invisible, in their homage to Christ, in their preparation for heaven. But where are the thoughts, born in these serene and sacred hours, to find their companionship? Where are these seeds to vegetate and bloom? The relations of social existence have a vast work to perform within us. Business, relaxation, literature, art; whatever addresses reason, taste, affection; whatever disciplines the sense to skill—the heart to virtue—the conduct to energy, patience, fortitude, belongs to God. They have been ordained for our improvement, and never can we enter into the full meaning of Christianity until we learn to make everything contribute to our moral and spiritual progress. Is it a fictitious fear or a profound reality, that the transition from an experimental Christianity to a sentimental and mystical Christianity is an easy process? The heart cannot be too frequently and pungently appealed to; but may not the appeal be too *exclusive?* If this is the fact, where but in the provisions of self-culture, as derived from the regimen of common life and the open universe, are we to seek the safe corrective, the sure and unfailing balance to emotional and reflective piety? Is it all a fable that Antæus must fall back upon the earth to recruit his strength?

There is one other remark that may be worthy of notice. The habit of inward effort to enlarge the scope of reflection, to strengthen conviction, to penetrate deeply into the reasons of things, to purify feeling, to expand the intellect by large thoughts and the heart by

generous sympathies; and above all, the constant exercise of our active faculties, whether of perception, will, or sensibility, in finding the auxiliaries of religious nurture in every phase of human life, are peculiarly demanded by the fact, that in this age of popular interests and general movements, we are peculiarly liable to what may be called the formative power of religious machinery. Surrounded by a vast "apparatus" of spiritual energy, our creed faithfully and fully expounded on each returning Sabbath, our praise embodied in printed hymns, our prayers led by others, our social meetings adapted to a regular order; in brief, a continued succession of precisely the same forms and a ceaseless direction of the mind in the same channels, we are strikingly exposed to the operation of those circumstances which tend to diminish freshness of impressions, force of personal effort, independence of individual aims, and sturdy robustness of sentiment. Such dangers must remain. The best earthly economy is inseparable from them. But a safeguard has been furnished in the agency of self-culture. By its instrumentality the associations of the multitude furnish materials for solitary study, the fellowship of the sanctuary heightens the charm of self-communion, the familiar routine perfects our individual freedom, and we attain the stature of men in Christ Jesus.

The religion of the New Testament is now thoroughly *vocalized*. It is sung in choirs. It is melodized in concerts. The swell of the organ floats the sound of human voices on its aërial waves and shakes the sanctuary with its triumphant exultations. Christianity is articulated in every variety of tone and modulation; whispered, shouted, thundered; "from lively to severe," if not "from grave to gay," it runs through all the gamut of utterance and holds the ear in firm captivity. Here is the logical voice, cold, dry and hard—here is the metaphysical voice, dull and dreamy—here is the philosophical voice, contented, calm, complacent—here is the didactic voice, firm and fearless—here is the descriptive voice, following the quick glances of the organ of sight, and beating time to the palpitations of the eyelids—here is the voice of denunciation, storming the citadel of sin—here is the voice of pathos, tenderness, expostulation, and love—all fulfilling their province with wondrous variety, skill, and success. It is certainly the speaking age of the Church. And we rejoice in it. But can we disguise the painful truth, that thousands depend on vocal instruction with too much satisfaction, and rest in it as a sort of intellectual finality? Faith *comes* by hearing. So argues the apostle, and so believe all Christians. But how does it *stay?* In what way is it to be matured and perfected? The action of preaching mind on hearing mind is absolutely essen-

tial; but it has its fixed limits. No amount, no excellence of oral instruction can fully develop character. Its use is to inform, to quicken, to transmute itself into recipient natures; and whenever that is done, the individual man must convert its influence into the means of personal power and progress. After all, it is a mere tributary to self-culture. Its specific design is to put the sympathetic spirit in the best possible position to exert its own faculties and build itself up in the knowledge and service of Christ.

Alluding to the charge against the Church of a want of interest in the philanthropic schemes of the day, Mr. Mercein proceeds, after repelling the false accusation, to make some remarks on the general subject. "Perhaps the irreligious philanthropists may see more clearly the outward and material machinery to be used in regenerating society, because their attention is not distracted to the want of that spiritual life in the world's heart, without which it cannot receive and perpetuate the new forms which it is proposed to give it. Earnest and enthusiastic spirits, men of noble energy and daring, need a field of exercise and display. A secular philanthropy is the chivalry of the nineteenth century." (P. 270). We wish that this view had been extended. If secular philanthropy had been satisfied to present its merits as philanthropy, if it had prudently and wisely confined itself within its own precincts, there might have been an occasion for honest differences of opinion; but there would have been none for differences of feeling. So far from adopting such a course, it has too often taken special pleasure in choosing an antagonistic attitude in respect to the Church. It has taunted, mocked, insulted ministers and members. It has even proclaimed its narrow, local, fugitive creed, with "pictures to match," as a substitute for Christianity. Don Quixote showed a glimmering of sense in selecting a windmill for attack, but they dash against the battlements of Zion. It is shocking to any moral sensibility to contemplate the vindictive malignity, the furious fanaticism, the wanton sacrifice of the finer, nobler traits of our nature in this fierce assault on the evils of society. A philanthropy of this sort profanes its own name. It can never do God's work. Whatever schemes of usefulness may be devised and executed, the first consideration is the effect on their own immediate adherents. They are viewed as exponents—as witnesses; and hence, if they are transformed into bigots and zealots, nothing can save their cause from odium and disgrace. There is a generous martyrdom that we all admire; but the martyrdom of courtesy, refinement, truth, and virtue, for the sake of consummating a benevolent enterprise, excites our commiseration, if not contempt. The influence of these movements on the

Church has been, in some instances, exceedingly disastrous. Good men have conceded too much to them. The attention of the Church has been frequently diverted to their measures, and its patronage, tacit or active, has been extended to them. Have we to learn at this late day where our strength lies? If our guns have been mounted for ages, have we now to dismount them for the purpose of proving their metal? No moral in Church history is plainer and fuller, than that the power of Christianity is in its concentration, in its asserted and vindicated supremacy, in its complete and perfect adaptation to the regeneration of the world. The simple reason why Christianity is comparatively inert and feeble in our hands, is because we fail to trust it. Our unbelief multiplies false auxiliaries, and in turn they educate our scepticism still further. Even where the institutions are not obnoxious to serious charges, is it not to be apprehended that we are distributing our capital into more forms of business than we can manage effectively? If the Mississippi were drained of its waters as the Church is drained of her intellectual and moral resources, it would need a number of Ohios and Missouris to pour a strong, full, broad current into its tropical gulf.

Had the plan of the work permitted, Mr. Mercein would, doubtless, have been gratified to exhibit the doctrine of the atonement in its relations to the scheme of redemption. The great truth of a vicarious offering, a sacrificial death for us, runs through the work both by necessary implication and formal statement; but, nevertheless, it is not developed as fully as we could have desired. The philosophy of the atonement may embarrass minds that accept it as a divine fact. Coleridge was an instance of this perplexity; and yet we think that the habit of dwelling on it as an expression of governmental principle is highly beneficial. Apart from this, it is so intimately connected with the condition and circumstances of our fallen, ruined, condemned nature in its moral suggestions, its spiritual significance, its prodigious weight upon the conscience and sensibilities, that we like to see it brought out in marked prominence whenever depravity, restoration, and eternal life are under review. We beg not to be understood as finding fault. It simply occurs to us, that the "*natural virtues*" have a terrible account to render with this event, even on the ground which they propose to occupy. Any theory of goodness, claiming the name and sanctions of religion, must insulate the death of Jesus Christ from all ordinary phenomena. The wickedness of the Jews is not sufficient to account for it. Alone must it stand among all the tragedies of earthly history. If it were a mere seal of martyrdom, it does not confer a particle of strength or interest on the truths which the inspired

teacher taught, nor does it set off with any more distinctness and adaptability the actions which he performed as our example. These rest on totally different grounds. Confronting that amazing spectacle, the "*natural virtues*" must feel, in moments of subdued thoughtfulness, that there is something found here, differing in kind, in purport, in significance, from all else in the universe; nor can we conceive how it is possible for noble and generous instinct, for manly sentiment, for responsive sensibility to suppress the rising suggestion, that there is a divine meaning here which penetrates the profoundest depths of our spiritual being.

The patient reader, who has accompanied us through this article, needs not to be assured that the subject of human depravity, actual, total depravity, has a peculiar interest for our thoughts. Were it a mere earthly thing, it would press itself on our consideration; it would be a mystery, calling in no uncertain or feeble tone for prompt and satisfactory solution. Never could we look into the eyes of childhood, never watch the deepening shadows on the hearthstone of home, never tread a silent churchyard, never commune with midnight stars, never scan the many-coloured panorama of life, without feeling that evil demanded explanation. But when we take it in all the dread relations of immortal existence, shaping those huge images that rise up from the rolling surge of eternity, and as silently sink back into its recovering waves, there is a terrible fascination in its influence that cannot be resisted. No sooner had man been expelled from Eden than this torturing idea began to agitate his soul. It expounded the curse. Fiercer than the fiery sword guarding the gates of Paradise it gleamed before him wherever necessity and sorrow bent his footsteps. The oldest annals, the remotest traditions, the earliest usages, present it to our contemplations. The records of patriarchal and Jewish life are full of its facts. The ancient books of the Brahmins, the speculations of Eastern Pantheism, the mythology of Lesser Asia, the symbolic parable of Prometheus, the fable of Cupid and Psyche, all assert its preponderance in the minds of men. Heathens have given it their most anxious thoughts; deists have struggled with it as a mighty nightmare. Not peculiar to Christianity, it is yet essential to its scheme of redeeming grace; and hence it is unfolded in the New Testament with a frequency, a force, an exhaustive fulness proportioned to its commanding importance. In every age it has been the foremost theme; in all philosophy it has been the returning enigma; in all culture it has proved itself to be the most profound science. Poetry has struck every string in its harp to its melancholy wail. One generation bequeaths it to another, and the

sorrow rolls on in an unabated tide. What a literature it has written! See Sir Thomas Browne musing over it in his Urn-Burial, Blair in his Grave, Hervey in his Meditations among the Tombs, Foster in his mournful questionings, Pascal in his devout contemplations! See Goethe and Byron throwing the quick, sharp glances of their bold imaginations into its massive gloom!—see philosophers like Coleridge, orators like Robert Hall, thinkers like Chalmers, divines like Wesley and Fletcher, yielding to it their most earnest studies, and breathing over it their most believing prayers!—see patient watchers at the hidden gates of heaven—watchers like Cowper—waiting for the awful mystery to depart!

It is not pain, it is not suffering that thus torments the mind. No; it is SIN, it is guilt that oppresses our anxious hearts.

ART. VI.—THE DOGMA OF THE IMMACULATE CONCEPTION.

1. "*Letters Apostolic of our Most Holy Lord, Pius IX., by Divine Providence Pope, concerning the Dogmatic Definition of the Immaculate Conception of the Mother of God,*" *given at Rome the sixth of the Ides of December*, 1854.
2. *J. Perrone: De Immaculato B. V. Mariae conceptu, etc.* [Can the Immaculate Conception of the Blessed Virgin Mary be defined by a Dogmatic Decree? A Theological Disquisition, by John Perrone, of the Society of Jesus, Professor of Theology in the Roman College.] 1848.
3. *Joannis Launoii, Constantiensis, Parisiensis Theologi, Opera Omnia, ad selectum ordinem revocata. III. Tom. fol. Colon*, 1731. [Tomi Primi Pars Prima, pp. 9–44: Praescriptiones de Conceptu B. Mariae Virginis, 1676: with the motto, from Bernard, "Virgo Regia falso non eget honore."]
4. *Versuch einer Geschichte des Marien-und-Annen-Cultus in der Katholischen Kirche*, von Cl. Frantz. 12mo. Halberstadt. 1854.
5. *Legends of the Madonna, as represented in the Fine Arts. Forming the Third Series of Sacred and Legendary Art.* By MRS. JAMESON. London. 1852.

DURING the seventeenth century, but not before, "Our Lady of the Immaculate Conception" was one of the favourite subjects of Christian art. Guido depicts the Virgin, crowned with twelve stars, standing on a crescent sustained by cherubs, with seraphim on either hand, floating between heaven and earth. Murillo, the greatest of Spanish artists, illustrated the devotion of Spain to the homage of Mary, by twenty-five pictures; the grandest of which is the "Great Conception of Seville," a city which became frantic with joy, when, in 1615–17, Paul V. sanctioned the office of the Immaculate Concep-

tion, and forbade other teaching.[*] The idea of these pictures is taken from the woman in the twelfth chapter of the Apocalypse, "clothed with the sun, and the moon under her feet, and upon her head a crown of twelve stars;" this great "wonder in heaven," the symbol of the Church, is made to be the mother of our Lord, instead of that "Jerusalem, which is the mother of us all."

In the Catacombs, and the mosaics before the sixth century, the mother of Christ is always represented as standing in a subordinate position, usually veiled. In the course of the seventh century, higher honours cluster around her radiant form; she is imaged forth as the bride of the Bridegroom, the type of the Church; as queen of heaven, of the angels, and of virgins. Even in the West, before 600, she is depicted as sitting on a throne, the queen of heaven. In mediæval times, her coronation by Christ becomes predominant; her sceptre is a sceptre of mercy, while our Saviour is seen in contrast, under the likeness of a stern judge; the mother is full of all compassion, the Redeemer becomes lenient for her sake. She is also the mother of sorrows, the "mater dolorosa," bearing the sword in her bosom, and as such she appeals to the tenderest and deepest sympathies of our nature, and feels all the woes of those who flee to her for succour. As the mother of the Redeemer, she exercises over him the rights of her divine maternity; through her intercession the grace of the Lord distils as dew upon the faithful.

All the acts of her life have been the themes for the painter, the sculptor and the poet. Apocryphal Gospels, none of which are older than the fourth century, supplying by inventions the silence of the New Testament, make Joachim and Anna to be her father and mother;[†] tell us that our Saviour was born in her fifteenth year, and that she lived eleven years at Ephesus with John, dying at the age of fifty-nine. Another tradition relates, that her tomb was opened three days after her burial, and that her body could not be found, but only a fragrant odour; that she was translated directly to heaven; and the festival of the assumption honours this miraculous and unwitnessed event. Though her death is assigned to A. D. 63, yet in no subsequent canonical work are these marvels recorded. But these fictitious biographies narrate all the details of her nativity, her presentation in the temple, and the scenes of her marriage, as well as the Scriptural facts of the annunciation, of the nativity of our Lord, of her purification and the flight into Egypt; legend and

---

[*] See Mrs. Jameson, pp. 45–58.

[†] Nicephorus's Eccl. Hist., 2, 3; Cotelerius ad Constit. Apostol. 3, 6. Thilo, Codex Apocr. Nov. Test., Evangelium de nativitate S. Mariae, Historia de nativ. Mariae, pp. 319–400.

fable carry her through the final scenes of earth, to her triumphal coronation in heaven. There is a perhaps unconscious, yet manifest attempt to make out a complete parallel between the successive events in the history of the mother and the stadia in the life of our Lord; she is as a woman, what Christ was as a man. And all of these wonderful legends are received as genuine by the Roman Catholic Church; it vouches for their verity, and celebrates festivals as a perpetual memorial.

In the Papal Church the veneration of the Virgin is the central point of the whole system of creature-worship, with which that Church itself, as now constituted, stands or falls. The working of the "mystery of iniquity" in that corrupt communion is nowhere more apparent, and in no point more capable of historical elucidation. Its paganizing tendencies are here open to the day; its invocations to Mary are more bold, more rapturous, more tender, and more universal, than to any other of the saints; and these religious observances have grown with each century of its history. Rome has here been consistent; and she has just placed the crown upon the completed system of idolatry by the dogmatic declaration, that the "blessed Virgin Mary was conceived without the infection of original sin," exempting her from the common heritage of the human race; thus, in yet another point, making her to be like our Lord, breaking down the last barrier to her full worship.

Mrs. Jameson, in her beautiful Legends of the Madonna, gives only the ideal and poetic aspect of this cultus; Mary is the type of womanhood, of which each nation, and each great school of art, has its special ideal. This work contemplates the subject chiefly from the æsthetic side. But the very fact that this worship is so fair in art is but another evidence of its peril. It is the most seductive and alluring aspect of a system, which is essentially pagan in its origin, its developments, its festivities.

The first trace of the worship of the Virgin, which history records, is the enumeration by Epiphanius,* among his eighty heresies of the festive rites of the *Collyridianæ*, a company of women in Arabia, in the last part of the fourth century, who paid divine honours to Mary, partaking around a table, adorned with myrtle, of small cakes, (*collyris*,) in the same manner as Cybele, the *magna mater deum*, had been worshipped in these regions and in Phrygia. The discussion of the heresy of Nestorius in the first half of the fifth century, condemned by the third general council at Ephesus, in 431, turned upon attributing to the Virgin the title of ϑεοτόκος, *Deipara*, afterward changed into the phrase, "*Mater Dei*," the "mother of God."

---

* Epiphanius, Haeres., lxxviii, lxxix.

It was not in honour of Mary, but to maintain the reality of the Incarnation, that this term was first used; but it gave a great impulse to her veneration. Effigies of the mother and Son become frequent, as sacred symbols, and supplant the cross. Christ begins to recede and his mother to come into the front rank of popular veneration; to Cyril of Alexandria, the chief opponent of Nestorius, is ascribed the introduction of the prayer, "Holy Mother of God, pray for us, poor sinners, now and in the hour of death." The angelic salutation "Ave Maria," becomes a popular greeting. Her perpetual virginity and divine maternity are tests of orthodoxy. The first traces of festivals in her honour soon follow; the Festival of the Annunciation (March 25, the season of the opening spring,) cannot be traced beyond the last part of the fourth, or the beginning of the fifth century;* her Purification (Feb. 2) follows in the sixth,† favoured by the Emperor Justinian, and Gelasius, Bishop of Rome; the Festival of the Assumption, on the 15th of August, already foreshadowed in the fable, follows in the course of the eighth and ninth centuries.‡ It is a singular coincidence, that at this time of the year, Astræa, goddess of justice, and Ceres, mother of fruits, and the Egyptian Isis, had been worshipped with special rites by the heathen of old, and sometimes depicted as rising from the earth to the sky. At the end of the seventh century, in the East, Mary's nativity had already been generally celebrated on the 8th of September; it follows somewhat later in the West; the testimonies for an earlier observance are insecure. John of Damascus, in the eighth century, says, that "the centuries contended for the honour of her birth." These festivals, to which others of less importance were afterward added, gave such splendour to her cultus, that Pope Sergius (c. 700) could boast of the superiority of the worship of the "bride of God," to that of Proserpine, "the bride of the god of the infernal regions;" and the Koran calls Jehovah, Christ, and Mary, "the three gods of the Christians." The first vestiges of "offices" for the public cultus are found among the Benedictines; from the eighth to the eleventh century, these are fully developed; the Cistercian order observed them daily, in

---

* First expressly mentioned in Council of Toledo, A. D. 659, of Guericke 2, s. 48.

† Augusti, Denkwürdigkeiten, Band iv, Bede, Hom. 5, in circumcis, mentions it as long extant.

‡ See Gieseler, 2, s. 158, note 12. Gregory of Tours, at the end of the sixth century, gives the legend in its fullest details. Jerome had already spoken in favour of the assumption, and Augustine declared that "he feared to say, that the blessed body in which Christ had been incarnate, could become food for the worms." See Frantz, "Geschichte des Mariencultus," s. 37. The Assumption has not been pronounced a dogma; it was sanctioned in the West by a council at Aix la Chapelle, 818, and by Leo IV., who made it a general festival.

seven canonical hours.* The Festival of the Visitation (July 2, 1381) completes the sacred seven. The golden period of her worship is identical with the height of the Papal power in the middle ages, from the eleventh to the thirteenth centuries; the rosary of Mary was introduced in the eleventh century;† the chivalry of the crusaders was inflamed with ardour by the belief in her presence; orders of knights vowed to defend her immaculateness with the sword;‡ poets sang her glories in the most exalted strains; art gave visible embodiment to all the legends of the past; the psalter itself was rewritten, so that all of its one hundred and fifty psalms should celebrate only the praises of "Mary, mother of God," "queen of Heaven," source of mercy, prevalent in intercession, the joy, the hope, the confidence of the faithful.§ To crown the whole, the very hut in which she lived was transported by angels from Galilee to Loretto.||

Into this period, which marks the acme of her cultus, falls the beginning of the controversy as to Mary's immaculate conception, which has been continued for seven hundred years, and is now declared to be dogmatically decided by the Roman pontiff. That decision is no accident, no arbitrary matter; it was necessary to the

---

* See Frantz, s. 63. In some cloisters, five psalms were repeated every day, whose first letters formed the name Maria; viz., "Magnificavit," Psa. cxxv, 3; "Ad Dom." Psa. cxix, 1; "Retribue," Psa. cxviii, 17; "In," Psa. cxxv, 1; "Ad te," Psa. cxxii, 1.

† See Niedner, Kirchengeschichte, s. 418.

‡ The Spanish order of St. Iago took the oath: "We swear to believe and defend, in public and private, that the Virgin Mary, our lady, was conceived without the stain of original sin." The Spanish order of Calatrava took a similar vow, with yet greater theological precision.

§ This Psalter has been ascribed to Bonaventure, and is published in his works; but it is probably from another source, though nearly contemporary, in the thirteenth century. Its praise of Mary is idolatrous, and its parodies of the Psalms are most irreverent: "The heavens declare thy glory, O Mary;" "Hear us, O lady, in the day of trouble;" "Offer unto our lady, ye sons of God, offer unto our lady praise and reverence." See So. Presb. Rev., Jan., 1855; on the authorship, compare Gieseler.

|| The holy house of Loretto, the "casa santa," the cottage in which Mary is said to have lived, was borne by angels in 1290, after the crusaders had lost their last possessions in the Holy Land, at first to Dalmatia, then to Recanati in Italy, and the next year to Loretto. By order of Sixtus V., it was enclosed in a grand cathedral, built by the architect Bramante. It is thirty-two feet long, thirteen high, and nineteen wide; it contains the very window through which Mary received the angelic visitation. The angels must have had grievous labour in carrying it through the air; but nothing is impossible to faith, as Archbishop Kenrick of St. Louis has shown in his work on the "Holy House," which is said to be too little known.

completeness of the Papal system of saint-worship; and it shows most clearly what that system really is and demands. Contrary as is the new decree to Scripture, to tradition, and to reason, involving as it does the claim to an infallibility which must be omniscient, it is still a decree demanded by the very necessities of the Papal system, exposing its true character, and prophesying its fate. If Mary be not free from all taint of original sin, she cannot be the object of such worship as the Papal Church sanctions and enjoins; and in the dogmatic declaration that she is thus exempt Scripture, tradition, and reason are superseded by Papal infallibility.

Before proceeding to examine the decree itself, and the arguments in its favour, we will present a cursory history of this celebrated controversy. The festival of the "*immaculate*" conception was not observed until more than a thousand or eleven hundred years after the birth of Christ. Perrone thinks it may have come from the East, but adduces no evidence. In the controversy between Ratramn and Radbert, in the ninth century, upon the Lord's supper, the question raised was as to the natural or supernatural birth of our Lord, but did not reach to the specific point of Mary's immaculate conception.* The first introduction of the festival is usually assigned by Roman Catholic writers to England, and to the influence of Anselm, Archbishop of Canterbury, about the year 1070; but this is wanting in historic certainty of evidence.† The true point of time for the festival and subsequent controversy is the attempt of certain canons of Lyons, in France, to introduce a "Feast of the Immaculate Conception" in the year 1140. Bernard, Abbot of Clairvaux, the saint of the century, the opponent of Abelard, the great orthodox name of the times, resists this festival as a "novelty," with the pertinent inquiry, "How have you come to make the discovery, that Mary was conceived without sin?" He was enthusiastic in his reverence for the Virgin, yet declares that "reason does not approve, nor ancient tradition commend" this novel rite and doctrine. He grants that she was "sanctified in the womb," as were Jeremiah and John the Baptist, while asserting that "Christ alone was conceived with-

---

* Radbert is claimed on the side of the immaculate conception, by Perrone, p. 83, sq. But his chief controversy is upon the matter of Christ's birth, whether Mary at that time was free from sin. In his work on the "Birth and Perpetual Virginity of Mary," he says, "that Mary was free from all original sin;" but when was she thus free? In her conception? That he does not assert. She was free when Christ was begotten. He says that "she was *sanctified* and purified by the Spirit." Cf. Gieseler 2, 1, s. 126.

† Anselm introduced into England the Festum Conceptionis *Domini*, sive Annunciationis Mariae; yet even this was ridiculed and opposed. See Gieseler, Kirchengesch., 2, 2, s. 474.

out sin."[*] No distinguished theologian of the twelfth or thirteenth century defended the dogma. The festival of the "conception" was increasingly observed in England and in France, but it was not termed the "immaculate" conception. That the "sanctification," and not the "conception" of Mary was the original object of the festival of the 8th of December, is the probable opinion, supported by the authority of Aquinas and Bellarmine, and by the contemporary acts and statutes,[†] from the twelfth and thirteenth centuries. Thomas Aquinas, Peter Lombard, Durandus, Bonaventure, all the great names of these times, opposed the new and extreme opinion, as we shall hereafter see; but it was in the necessities of the system that it should prevail; it gained in popular applause what it lacked in theological authority. Duns Scotus, "the subtle doctor," was the first of the scholastics who defended the opinion; but even he expresses himself with great reserve. He says: "Deus potuit facere, quod ipsa nunquam fuisset in peccato originali, potuit etiam fecisse, ut tantum in uno instanti esset in peccato; potuit etiam facere, ut per tempus aliquod esset in peccato, et in ultimo illius temporis purgaretur;" (In Sent., lib. iii, dist. 3, qu. i, § 9;) and he adds, "which of these three is actually true, God knows; if it is not opposite to the authority of the Church or of Scripture, it seems probable that we should attribute to Mary that which is more excellent." Yet he also admits, that if the Virgin Mary had not had original sin, she would not have needed the grace of Christ. Duns Scotus, it is also reported, defended the dogma before the University of Paris, against two hundred Dominicans, and brought the university to the decree, that "none should be admitted to the scholastic degrees," who did not maintain this "pious opinion;" but Scotus died in 1308, and the first report of this disputation is from Franciscan authorities, nearly two centuries afterward,[‡] and in the acts of the university there is no account of the matter. As late as 1380, the university speaks only of the "Festival of the Conception," and in 1387 it declares the immaculate conception to be "a

---

[*] Bernardi Epistola 174 ad Canonicos Lugdunenses: "Our Lord Jesus Christ alone was conceived of the Holy Ghost." Bulaeus, in his "History of the University of Paris," says that the canons of Lyons affirmed that they had a document from heaven, prescribing the observance. Bernard tells them that Rome has not sanctioned the observance.

[†] Cf. Gieseler, 2, 2, s. 475, note 16, containing extracts from the Council of Oxford, as late as 1222, and from French statutes of the thirteenth century.

[‡] The Franciscan, Bernardinus de Bustis, about 1480, and Pelbartus Temestarius, about 1500. See Gieseler, u. s. "The later Franciscans," says Gieseler, "are surprised that the 'subtle doctor' says so little of the matter, but console themselves with the belief that his chief works on the subject have been lost."

probable opinion," in opposition to the views advocated by the Dominican, John De Montesonus, who maintained that belief in the immaculate conception was a sin against the faith. The above decree as to the "degrees" was not made until 1497.

From the time of Duns Scotus, the controversy assumed a more definite form, and it is made more spicy and inveterate by the hostilities of the rival orders of the Dominicans and Franciscans, the former supporting the opinion of Aquinas, the "angelic doctor," and the latter of Scotus, the "subtle doctor." New miracles, revelations, and proofs, as well as popular fanaticism, urge on to a further decision. The anti-Pope Clement VII., in the exile at Avignon, in 1389, follows the lead of the University of Paris, and expresses an opinion favourable to the doctrine, by condemning the views of the Dominican Montesonus. St. Bridget has revelations for the Dominicans, and St. Catharine of Sienna has different ones for the Franciscans. The Council of Basle, in 1439, controlled by French influence, declared that Mary "was never actually subject to original sin," but did not affirm it to be an article of positive faith.[*] This decree was passed while the council was in conflict with the Pope; consequently it is not recognised as having authority.

A new stage in the history of the dogma is marked by the so-called "Constitutions" of Sixtus IV., himself a Franciscan. In the year 1477 he issued a bull, recommending the celebration of the "conception of the immaculate Virgin," not of the "immaculate conception" of the Virgin; and in 1483, in another bull, the "*Grave nimis*," he condemns those who assert that the defenders of the immaculate conception are heretical, and also those who maintain that the advocates of the opposite opinion are guilty of the crime of heresy, or of mortal sin; "cum nondum sit a Romana ecclesia et Apostolica sede decisum." Such is the substance of these famous "Constitutions," after which the Sorbonne becomes still more zealous against the Dominicans; in 1509, four of that order[†] were burned at Bern, giving new confirmation to the "privilege of Mary." The Council of Trent did not venture upon a final decision, though urged

---

[*] Conc. Basil. Sess. xxxvi, d. xv, Kal., Oct., 1439: "Nos vero * * * doctrinam illam disserentem, gloriosam originem dei genitricem Mariam præveniente et operante divini numinis gratia singulari nunquam actualiter subjacuisse originali peccato, sed immunem semper fuisse ab omni originali et actuali culpa * * tanquam piam, etc., tenendam * * diffinimus et declaramus."

[†] The Dominicans at Bern set up an image of the "mother of God," which wept bloody tears; they received letters directly from heaven, and practised abominable impositions, in advocacy of their views. Cf. Hottinger, Hist. Eccl., P. V., Hase, Kirchengeschichte, s. 339.

to do so, but merely confirmed these Constitutions, declaring that "in its decree concerning original sin, it did not intend to include the blessed and immaculate Virgin Mary, mother of God."[*] This left the whole question still open.

Pius V., in 1570, confirmed the Constitutions of Sixtus by condemning certain propositions of Bains, in his bull, "*Super Speculum*;" he says expressly, that the Council of Trent "gave each party permission to hold either side of the question," and forbids all popular controversy; he also first inserted into the Roman breviary and reformed missal, an office for the "conception of the Virgin Mary," to be read on the 8th of December, changing the word "nativity" into "conception;" so late was this change made even in Rome itself.[†] Pope Paul V., in 1616, and Gregory XV., in 1622, left the matter undecided and forbade dissension, though urged to a decision. Bellarmine, the greatest of the Papal controversialists, declares, "non haberi apud Catholicos pro re certa et explorata ac fide Catholica tenenda, beatam Virginem sine peccato fuisse conceptam;" and adds, "hanc opinionem non esse ullo modo hæreticam vel erroneam judicandam;" as also "non esse temerariam sed piam admodum ac probabilem atque adeo contraria sententia longe probabiliorem."[‡] Pope Alexander VII, in 1661, in the bull, "*Sollicitudo omnium*," again forbids dispute; he also commends the piety of those who defend the privilege of Mary, and speaks of the "immaculate conception of the Virgin," in distinction from the "conception of the immaculate Virgin."[§] Clement XI., in 1708, reëstablished the festival, in the bull "*Commissi nobis*," but he calls it the "conception of the immaculate Virgin." The "Christian Remembrancer" contends that this bull decided the controversy, and made the present action of the Pope needless; but this bull relates to the festival, and terms the Virgin, and not her conception, "immaculate."[||]

---

[*] Launoy, Præscriptiones u. s., contests the authenticity of this decree of the Synod of Trent, asserting that it is not found in the original editions of the acts of the Council; but he is probably incorrect. The decree is alleged to have been passed in the session of June 17, 1546.

[†] See Perrone, p. 29. Our citations are from the German version.

[‡] Amiss. Grat. 4, 15. See Winer, "Comparative Darstellung," s. 57.

[§] The "Letters Apostolic" of Pius IX. say that Alexander's words are "evidently decretive;" they certainly are almost identical with the form enforced by Pius IX.: "Vetus est Christi fidelium erga ejus beatissimam Matrem V. M. pietas, sententium ejus animam in primo instanti creationis atque infusionis in corpus fuisse speciali Dei gratia et privilegio, intuitu meritorum Jesu Christi ejus filii, humani generis redemptoris, a macula peccati originalis præservatam immunem, atque in hoc sensu ejus conceptionis festivitatem solemni ritu colentium et celebrantium." Cf. Deuzinger, Enchiridion, p. 249.

[||] See Christ. Rembr., vol. xxiii, p. 408, sq.

Gregory XVI., in 1834, at the appeal of French bishops, in consequence of a movement begun by a remarkable coincidence again at Lyons, where the controversy in 1140 had its origin, ordered that the designation "immaculate" should be inserted in the preface to the mass of the conception; and in 1844, that Mary should be invoked in other litanies as "queen conceived without original sin."

Such has been the development of this dogma to the time of the present pontiff. For the last century and a half it had excited comparatively little discussion. The Roman Catholics seemed content to leave it as an undecided point, a matter of indifference. The French clergy showed little zeal, and many of her theologians were opposed to it; even the ardour of Spain was relaxed. But the revival of the Papal claims in new vigour, the pressure of the ultramontane influence, superseding even in France the traditional Gallican liberties, the necessary and consequent excitement of popular superstition, have pressed the matter to what is esteemed an authoritative and final decision. The apparition of the Virgin to the herdsmen of La Salette, even now vehemently contested in France itself;* the "miraculous medals" distributed by millions throughout Europe; the revived zeal of the "Sodalities," for the worship of the Virgin—have all, within the last twenty-five years, inflamed the popular ardour, and served to bring out most clearly the inherent and necessary tendencies of the Papal system. The Jesuits have lent their ubiquitous aid to this work, and it falls in with all the plans and aspirations of the ultramontane party, who seek for power through superstition, and gladly welcome a decree which fosters superstition and exalts the prerogative of infallibility in the mouth of the Pope alone.

Pope Pius IX., during his whole pontificate, has shown himself the most devoted of the worshippers of Mary. In 1847, he confirmed the decree of Gregory XVI., in respect to the introduction of the term "immaculate" in the liturgy, especially in the preface of the mass for the "Conception," with additional privileges to the order of Preachers for their zeal.† In his exile at Gaeta, in 1849, he addressed his famous "Encyclical, on the Mystery of the Immaculate Conception," of the date of February 2, to the patriarchs, primates, archbishops, and bishops of the whole Catholic Church, affirming the existence of "an ardent desire throughout the Catholic world, that the Apostolic See should at length, by some solemn judgment, define that the most holy Mother of God, the most loving mother of us all, the Immaculate Virgin Mary, had been conceived without original sin." "These desires," he adds, "have been most acceptable and delight-

---

* See "The Christ. Times," London, Dec. 20, 1854. † See Perrone, pp. 337, 338.

ful to us, who, from our earliest years, have had nothing dearer, nothing more at heart, than to revere the most blessed Virgin Mary with an especial piety and homage, and the most intimate affections of our heart, and to do everything which might seem likely to procure her greater glory and praise, and to amplify her worship." From such a declaration he anticipates signal blessings to the Church, tossed to and fro, and fallen upon evil times. He says he has committed the investigation of the whole matter to a special congregation of cardinals and selected ecclesiastics, illustrious for piety and wisdom, and versed in divine things; and he invokes the prayers and counsel of all the bishops to whom the Encyclical is addressed. "You know full well, venerable brethren, that the *whole ground of our confidence* is placed in the most holy Virgin," since "God has vested the plenitude of all good in Mary, so that henceforth if there be in us any hope, if there be any grace, we know that it is from her that it redounds . . . . . for such hath been the will of Him who would have us possess all through Mary."* A commission was appointed for the examination of the question, under the presidency of Cardinal Fornarini; Cardinal Lambruschini produced his Tract, and Perrone the work at the head of this article; Passaglia has also written a large essay, and the results of these renewed investigations are issued by the Propaganda press, in two large quartó volumes. The special commission reported, in a full conclave of the Sacred College, 27th May, 1854. Answers had come from six hundred and two bishops, all of them favourable to the dogma, though fifty-two doubted the opportuneness, and four the possibility of a decision.† The "special congregation" demanded the definition with alacrity and zeal. A Consistory of consultation was proclaimed and held at Rome, November, 4, 1854; it was not a general council, nor was any authority attributed to it. Fifty-four cardinals, forty-six archbishops, and about four hundred bishops are reported to have been present at these deliberations; five hundred and seventy-six votes are said to have been cast for the dogma, and only four against it; among the latter were the Archbishop de Sibour, of Paris, on the ground, that the pope had no power to decide such a question; and also the bishop Olivier of Evreux, lately deceased, who sent in his vote by proxy. On the 8th of December, in St. Peter's, in the midst of the celebration of the "Conception," in the presence of more than two hundred ecclesiastical dignitaries, and in answer to a petition presented by the dean of the Sacred College of the Cardi-

---

* Cited from Gregory, de Expos. in libros Regum.

† These letters, with others from sovereigns, orders, and associations, are printed in nine volumes.

nals, the supreme pontiff, with a "tremulous" voice, read in Latin the following decree:—"We declare, pronounce, and define, that the doctrine which holds that the blessed Virgin Mary, at the first instant of her conception, by a singular privilege and grace of the omnipotent God, in virtue of the merits of Jesus Christ, the Saviour of mankind, was preserved immaculate from all stain of original sin, has been *revealed by God*, and therefore should firmly and constantly be believed by the faithful."*

The cannon of the castle of St. Angelo, the joyful chime of all the bells of Rome, the enthusiastic plaudits of the assembled thousands, the magnificent illumination of St. Peter's church, and the splendour of the most gorgeous festive rites, gave response to the infallible decree. It was a grand pageant, befitting an idolatrous enthusiasm. The pope himself, with "trembling joy," crowned the image of the Virgin; medals of Australian gold were struck, and distributed in her honour. "Rome," say the beholders, "was intoxicated with joy." An infallible voice had spoken; a new article of faith was announced by "divine" authority; the people rejoice in hope that Mary will be yet more "propitious," that her "prevalent intercession will give peace and plenty, will stay the power of infidelity, put an end to insurrection, and crown Rome with higher honour and success." The controversy of seven hundred years is brought to a final decision; Rome is committed irrevocably to the worship of the "Virgin mother of God, conceived without original sin." "Roma locuta est," and doubt is now heresy. The work begun by the third general council at Ephesus, in 431, proclaiming Mary "the mother of God," is declared to be consummated by the Papal decree of December 8, 1854, asserting the privilege of her immaculate conception, on the authority of Peter's chair.

What, now, are the grounds, what is the proof of this dogma of the immaculate conception, to which, as we have seen, the whole history and the very necessities of the Roman Catholic system, have forced that corrupt communion to gravitate? Can it be proved by Scripture? Is it consonant even with tradition? Can theologi-

---

* See the "New-York Freeman's Journal and Catholic Register," Feb. 17, 1855, which contains in full the "Letters Apostolic." Immediately following the above definition are the words of "infallible" warning. "Wherefore, if *any* shall dare —which God avert!—to *think* otherwise than as it has been defined by Us, they should know and understand that they are condemned by their own judgment, that they have suffered shipwreck of the faith, and have revolted from the unity of the Church; and besides, by their own act they subject themselves to the penalties justly established, if what they think they should *dare to signify by word, writing, or any other outward means.*" The claim of Papal infallibility has here reached its acme.

cal or rational arguments of sufficient cogency be alleged in its favour? Or, is it merely the full development of an evil inherent in the whole system of that apostate Church, and supported as a dogma in the last analysis, only by the bare and irrational claim of papal infallibility?

The work of Cardinal Perrone is one of the most authoritative and complete exhibitions of the papal view, and is accompanied with the papal sanction. The author is now "general rector of the Roman College," and is styled "the prince of contemporary theologians." He was born in 1794, at Chieri, a village near Turin; at twenty-one years of age he joined the company of the Jesuits; he succeeded to the chair of Bellarmine, Suarez, and Vasquez, in the Roman College in 1823, where he has ever since taught, with the exception of a few years of absence. To great learning he adds no mean dialectical skill. He is honoured as are few of the Italian theologians; he is a member of the Congregation charged with the examination of the provincial councils, and the revision of the books of the Oriental Churches; he is also an official "consultor" of the Congregations of the Propaganda, of Rites, and of Extraordinary Ecclesiastical Affairs; and he was a member of the special commission appointed to examine the dogma of the conception. His "Prælectiones Theologicæ," nine vols., Rome, 1835 sq., have been through twenty-five editions; portions of it have been separately published; an abridgment of this work, in four volumes, has had some twenty editions. Perrone is also the author of a "Synopsis of the History of Theology compared with Philosophy," Rome, 1845, and of a work on "Protestantism and the Rule of Faith," published in three vols., in 1853, a complete storehouse of all the arguments and all the calumnies against the Protestants. The "Two Præscriptions" of the Jansenist, John Launoy, contained in the first volume of his collected works, were written to expose the groundlessness of the argument from tradition, urged in favour of the dogma. They breathe the spirit, and exhibit the learning of the old Gallican Church. Perrone honours them with especial polemics. They present an array, by one of the ablest and most learned of the French Church, of those authorities which the new decree tramples under foot. The summary of Launoy's argument is, that before 1300 the Church knew no other doctrine than that Mary was conceived in original sin; that Scotus's reasonings are futile; that the early Franciscans themselves rejected the dogma; that the same was the case with Loyola and the first Jesuits, and that seven popes have declared against the dogma. The remainder of the "Præscriptions," so called in imitation of Tertullian's work, is devoted to an examination

of the attitude of the University of Paris in respect to the doctrine.*

Perrone states carefully the point and aim of his whole argument in the question, which makes the title of his work: "Can the Immaculate Conception of the blessed Virgin be defined by a dogmatic decree?" That is, Is there sufficient ground or basis in Scripture, in tradition, and in theology, for declaring it to be an article of faith? Or, in yet other words, Has the doctrine of the Immaculate Conception always been of the faith of the Church?

He is also correct, and gives an accurate statement of the real question, in asserting that it is a question of *fact;* not of theory, not of possibility, not of necessity, but simply of fact. Has it been divinely revealed, as a fact, that Mary was exempt from all taint of original sin? The question is not at all of a probable opinion, nor of a speculative possibility, but about a fact, which only Omniscience could know, which only God could reveal.

What is now this alleged fact; or, in other words, What is the dogma of the Immaculate Conception? Before proof can be brought, or testimony weighed, the doctrine itself must be clearly stated. And upon this point there is no uncertainty. The decree of Pius IX., already recited, states the point with sufficient clearness. Were it not for some misapprehension, it would not be necessary to say, that it has nothing to do with the conception of our Lord, whether he was himself without sin, or Mary without sin when he was conceived in her womb. Nor is it, among the Romanists, a question as to whether Mary was actually sinless in all her life; for, whether with or without proof, this point is conceded by all Roman Catholic divines; it was as earnestly maintained by Bernard as by Scotus, by the Dominicans as by the Franciscans, as was also her perpetual virginity. Nor is it a question as to whether Mary was "sanctified" in the womb, for the disputants agree, whether with or without evidence, that she was thus sanctified, and in the womb of her mother; Catherine of Sienna, who prophesied for the Dominicans, says that this occurred "three hours after her conception." But if she was sanctified, then she needed to be sanctified, that is, she was in a sinful state, under the dominion of original sin, for a time, longer or shorter, as it is said were also Jeremiah and John the Baptist. The question is not, whether she was "sanctificata," but whether she was "sancta;" not whether she was an immaculate virgin, but whether

---

* Besides these works, we have made use of the collection of testimonies upon the subject contained in Petavius's great work, "de Theologicis Dogmatibus," vol. iv, lib. xiv, c. 2, and of the copious and authentic citations in Gieseler's "Kirchengeschichte."

she was immaculate in her conception—whether her conception was immaculate. The question is, Was Mary ever in the least degree, or for even a passing moment, under the taint of original sin, or wholly and ever exempt, from the first instant of her conception, through a singular privilege? The dogma asserts that she was exempt, and asserts it as a *fact*. This is her "prerogative;" this is the "pia sententia."

Only one other point needs to be stated in the way of preliminary explanation; and that is, what is meant by the "first instant of conception." Here, again, the declarations are precise. Roman Catholic theologians usually distinguish between the "active" and the "passive" conception, and make the question, as does Perrone, refer exclusively to the latter.* The former, the "active conception," is the marital act, the formation of the body; the latter, the "passive conception," is the infusion of the rational soul into, or its union with the seed or body; and the dogma declares, that in this "passive conception" the soul of Mary was sinless, freed by special privilege from all taint of original sin, which, but for such privilege, would have been her lot. Perrone compares it, following Bellarmine and others, to the liberation of a prisoner from prison before he has been put into it, a comparison which both illustrates his position, and, as we shall see, shows some of its difficulties.

The question which Perrone and the other advocates of the "pious sentiment" undertake to answer in the affirmative, is just this: Is there adequate evidence to establish the fact, as divinely revealed, that Mary, in the above sense, was conceived immaculate?

The three chief sources of argument to establish this alleged fact are Scripture, tradition, and the theological proofs, including the argument of congruity or fitness.

The Scriptural argument for the dogma is exceedingly slight, and is virtually abandoned by Perrone himself.† He rejects as insufficient the mystical application of the personified Wisdom, and the types and figures which many of the fathers so freely apply to the Virgin. Even the angelic salutation, (Luke i, 28, sq.,) he concedes, derives all its weight, not from itself, but from the interpretation of the fathers; "in itself considered it gives only a conjecture." But why even a conjecture? The greeting runs, Χαῖρε, κεχαριτωμένη; it implies grace; it says and implies nothing about her original state. But the passage claimed as having argumentative force, "the only one," says Perrone, is Genesis iii, 15: "And I will put enmity between thee and the woman, and between thy seed and her seed; it [she]

---

* Some writers distinguish three acts in the conception, as Gonzalez, cited by Perrone.

† Perrone, pp. 35–38, 57–64, 112–116.

shall bruise thy head, and thou shalt bruise his heel." The argumentation here is curious. The received Vulgate reading, not found, however, in all the copies, is "ipsa," *she;* while the Hebrew reads הוא, he, or it; Jerome, too, reads "ipse;" Sixtus V. edition of the Septuagint reads *αυτός*. And then Perrone contends, that it is indifferent which reading is adopted, because, at any rate, Mary could not have had the power to conquer the serpent excepting through Christ. But how does this prove the Immaculate Conception—give to the dogma "a firm foundation?" Simply for the reason, that in these words a "special privilege is conferred upon Mary," and that special privilege could "only have been the immunity from original sin." But the privilege conferred is solely, even on the author's own ground, that she should be in some way a means of subduing Satan, and she was this as the mother of our Lord. And to assert, that in order to be the mother of Christ, she must be free from original sin, is purely to beg the whole question. The "Letters Apostolic" of Pius IX. upon the dogma, sanction infallibly the application of the clause "bruise thy head" to Mary, who, the pope says, "has crushed the serpent's head with her *immaculate foot.*"

The Biblical argument against the immaculate conception is simple and cogent. Mary is nowhere made an exception to the common heritage of the race. The whole human family, Christ alone excepted, is declared to be involved in original sin, through the fall of Adam; and also, without exception, the whole race is declared to be in need of redemption through the merits of Christ. The passages to prove these points we need not cite, since the Romanists concede their existence, however much they may differ in the interpretation of original sin, from the common doctrine of the Reformed Churches.* Since the Scriptures do not make an exception in the case of Mary, neither can we; to make such an exception we need unequivocal inspired authority. And if we make it in the case of Mary, why not, as Bernard himself argued, by the same reason and necessity, make it in respect to Mary's parents, grand-parents, and so on, up to Adam himself? If it is in any way necessary or needful, from the law of descent, or for the completeness of the Incarnation, that our Saviour should be born of a mother free from the hereditary fault of the race, the same necessity, under the same law, must carry us as far back as the law itself reaches.

How does the cardinal meet the difficulty raised by these two

---

* Perrone cites and approves the following passages: Job xiv, 14; Psa. l, 7; Romans iii, 23; v, 12; Eph. ii, 3; Romans v, 18; 1 Cor. xv, 22; 2 Cor. v, 14, 15.

doctrines? He does this in respect to the universal need of redemption, by asserting that there is a twofold mode of redemption, through the blood and merits of Christ: he concedes that Mary had need of the redemption; that, "considered in and by herself, she was subject to original sin," and that it was on the ground of Christ's merits that she was exempted; but he says, that she was redeemed before original sin touched her at all, as when a debt is paid before a man is put into prison; all the rest of mankind have their debts paid only after actually being in bondage to sin. Whether this position does not really annul the dogma,—and it is also the position of the infallible decree of Pius IX.,—we shall examine by and by. But, in addition to this, Perrone also urges, in reply to the Scriptural argument, that "papal decrees, and the decision of Trent in the case have annulled the application of the Scriptural passages to the matter in question," so that they can no longer be adduced. Popes, he says, have repeatedly called the dogma a "pious" opinion, and declared it to be not contrary to the faith; and the Council of Trent expressly declared, that "in the doctrine of original sin Mary was not excluded." This is certainly sufficiently audacious, and shows how infallibility deals with Scripture. If the pope should declare himself to be sinless, the argument would hold just as well: for it amounts to this, that papal infallibility may annul the application of a Scriptural truth to cases which are embraced in that application. But other popes—seven, Launoy says and proves—have given a counter declaration; between two contrary infallibilities who shall decide? And yet again, Perrone asserts, that these Scriptural declarations about original sin and the need of redemption do apply in some sense even to Mary; and he also asserts, that papal infallibility has decided that they are not to be thus applied. And who shall decide between these two positions; and who can hold them both?

For all who receive the Scriptures as the word of God, having ultimate authority, the evidence against the dogma is decisive. And the only conclusion to be drawn on this ground of argument is, that in the decree of the Immaculate Conception we have that asserted as a *fact* which is plainly contrary to Scripture. An infallible pope here decides not with, nor yet without, but *against* Scripture teaching. For all, too, who admit the *equal* authority of Scripture and tradition, it would seem to be a plain inference, that the equality is destroyed so soon as a doctrine is declared to be of the faith, which is not only found in tradition alone, but also in a tradition which contradicts the Scriptures. Granting that the whole of tradition is for the dogma, by a unanimous consent, if it be admit-

ted contrary to the Scriptures, the two authorities are no longer equal; the tradition is made superior. But, in fine, conceding even this, namely, that a unanimous tradition can supersede the Scriptures themselves, can the dogma of the Immaculate Conception be proved to be a part of the general tradition of the Roman Catholic Church? Does tradition, the second source of argument in its favour, support, substantiate, authorize this new decree?

Supposing tradition to be unanimous and complete in the matter, we do not see how it can prove the point which Perrone declares is to be proved; that is, the *fact* of the Immaculate Conception. Only Omniscience could be cognizant of such a recondite fact—only a special revelation could communicate that knowledge to others. Now, none of the fathers, and none of the schoolmen, and none of the popes, profess to have had a specific revelation upon the point of fact, that is, a revelation assuring them, on direct divine authority, that the Virgin Mary, at the instant of the union of the soul with the seed, was by grace kept free from all touch of original sin. Yet that is the fact which is to be proved, and proved on divine authority, on the authority of a specific revelation about this specific fact.

But, waiving this point, we come to the tradition itself. Is the dogma a part of the tradition of the Church, so that, if tradition be recognised as an ultimate source of appeal, we should be warranted in saying that the position is established? What is tradition, on the ground of the Roman Catholics themselves? Their standards declare it to be "equally with Scripture, the word of God;" and, in distinction from Scripture, to contain those truths, "quae ab ipsius Christi ore ab apostolis acceptæ, aut ab ipsis apostolis Spiritu Sancto dictante, quasi per manus traditæ ad nos usque pervenerunt;" and they further speak of such truths as "tanquam vel ore tenus a Christo vel a Spiritu Sancto dictatæ et *continua successione* in Ecclesia Catholica conservatæ." These are the formal statements in the decrees of the Council of Trent, sess. iv., decree 1. The "Professio Fidei Tridentinæ" of Pius IV., made binding upon the whole "representative Church," by Papal Bulls,* enforces the declaration, "Nec eam (Sacram Scripturam) umquam, nisi juxta *unanimum* consensum Patrum, accipiam et interpretabor." This is also in accordance with the decree on the "use of the Scriptures," adopted in the fourth session of the Council of Trent: "Ut nemo—contra *unanimum consensum* Patrum Scripturam Sacram interpretari audeat."† In sess. xiii., c. 2, tradition is designated as the "uni-

---

* Those of Pius IV., viz., "Injunctum nobis," and "In sacrosanctu." 1564.

† See also Concil. Trid., sess. xxiii., cap. iii, on the "unanimous consent of the Fathers," as adduced in favour of ordination.

versus ecclesiæ sensus." If anything can be inferred from these authentic statements it is, that that only is to be received as a true tradition, or can be solidly proved by tradition, which can be traced to Christ, or to the apostles, in a continual succession, and which has for it the "unanimous consent" of the fathers and teachers of the Church.

In applying this authentic interpretation of the idea of tradition to the dogma of the Immaculate Conception, it will be found to hold true that the weight of tradition is adverse to it, that the oldest and best tradition is against it, that the greatest doctors of the middle ages are also opposed, and that the authorities since the Reformation are hopelessly at variance.

Before the breaking out of the controversy between the canons of Lyons and Bernard in 1140, all the great teachers are silent or adverse. The question does not exist for them; they know nothing of this specific doctrine; they speak in respect to original sin, and the need of redemption in such a way as to prove that the Immaculate Conception of Mary could not have been any part of their creed. Their praises of the Virgin are often immoderate; they defend her perpetual virginity;* many of them believe that she was "sanctified" in the womb; most of them declare that she never was guilty of actual sin; but they do not know anything about her exemption from all infection of original sin.

Augustine defends her only against the charge of actual sin.† "Excepta sancta Virgine Maria, de qua propter honorem Domini nullam prorsus, *cum de peccatis agitur*, haberi volo quæstionem." This passage is quoted in favour of the dogma, but it plainly refers only to actual transgression, and it is contained in a reply to the position of Pelagius, that there were saints who had not sinned. In his treatise on the Remission of Sins,‡ this greatest of the Latin fathers says explicitly that Christ alone was without sin: "Solus ergo ille etiam, homo factus, manens Deus, peccatum nullum habuit unquam;" nor does he intimate any exception. In his work De Genesi, ad. lit. c. 18, n. 32, he speaks of "the body of Christ as taken from the flesh of a woman, who was conceived of a mother with sinful flesh;" and he indicates a clear distinction between Mary's nature and Christ's nature in this respect. Augustine's followers make similar statements. Eusebius Emissenus (supposed by some to be Hilary) on the "Nativity" says, "From the bond of the old sin is not even the mother of the Redeemer free." Fulgentius writes, "The flesh of

---

* Her perpetual virginity is defended by Epiphanius, (Hær. 78,) by Jerome adversus Helvidianum, etc.; and it soon becomes a common position.

† De Natura et Gratia, c. 36.

‡ Book ii, c. 24, § 38.

Mary, which was conceived in unrighteousness in a human way, was truly sinful flesh;" and he adds, "that this flesh is in itself truly sinful," referring to Paul's use of the term "flesh," to designate our common hereditary sinfulness. Others of the fathers make use of similar statements, irreconcilable with a belief in the Immaculate Conception.[*]

It is, indeed, true, that the fathers do not often speak directly upon the point in question; but this is for the simple reason, conclusive against the claim of universality, that they did not know anything about it. The doctrine is declared, A. D. 1140, by Bernard, to be a "novelty;" and he says that the festival is "the mother of presumption, the sister of superstition, and the daughter of levity."[†] Others of the earlier fathers speak of Mary in such a way as is absolutely irreconcilable with the idea that they believed in her Immaculate Conception. Hilary declares that she is exposed to the fire of judgment: "If that virgin which could compass God is to come into the severity of the judgment, who will dare desire to be judged of God?"[‡] Irenæus, Tertullian, Origen, Basil the Great, and Chrysostom, do not hesitate to speak of faults of Mary, of her being rebuked by Christ. "If Mary," says Origen, "did not feel offence at our Lord's sufferings, Jesus did not die for her sins;" Chrysostom ascribes to her "excessive ambition at the marriage festival at Cana;" Basil thinks that she, too, "wavered at the time of the crucifixion;" all of which statements are utterly inconsistent, not only with the dogma of the Immaculate Conception, but also with a belief in her perfect innocency.[§]

Tertullian, de Carne Christi, § xvi, declares that "Christ, by putting on the flesh, made it his, and *made it sinless*;" Irenæus, "that Christ made human nature pure *by* taking it;" Athanasius, on the "Incarnation," teaches the same doctrine, that "Christ sanctified his own body," and that "he hath purified the body, which was in itself corruptible." Of course, the body he assumed was not in and of itself sinless.[||] Gregory of Nazianzum, and John of Damascus, (730,) teach expressly that the Virgin was sanctified by the

---

[*] See Perrone, pp. 40, sq. The Dominican Bandellus, in his "De Singulari Puritate et Prærogativa Conceptionis Christi," 1470, has collected some four hundred testimonies against the dogma from the fathers; so the Cardinal Turrecamata, De Veritate Conceptionis. 1550.

[†] Ep. 174, ad Canon. Lugd., § 5, sq., cf. Serm. 78 in Cant.

[‡] Hil. in Psa. cxix, lib. 3, § 12, cf. Tracts for Times 79, p. 36.

[§] Cf. Gieseler, 1, § 99, note 30; with the references to Irenæus iii, 18; Tertullian de Carne Christi, 7; Origen in Lucam Hom., 17; Basil Ep., 260 (317); Chrys. Hom. 45 in Matth., Hom. 21 in Joh.

[||] See Christian Remembr., vol xxiii, pp. 383–385.

Holy Ghost.[*] If Christ, by assuming human nature in Mary, "made it sinless," it was not so before his incarnation.

The innumerable passages from the fathers, in which they declare the universality of sin, and the universal need of redemption through Christ, without making any exception in favour of the Virgin, we need not cite, because their existence is unquestioned. They have full force in the argument, however, because there are no counter testimonies to be adduced.

The citations from the fathers, which Perrone brings in favour of his dogma, are all fairly interpreted on the supposition that they believed Mary to have been sanctified in the womb, or pure as a virgin, or not subject to actual sin. For example, when Ambrose says "that Mary is an incorrupt virgin, a virgin freed by grace from all stain of sin;" when Augustine speaks of her as "without sins;" and when Ephræm declares her to be "an immaculate and spotless virgin, incorrupt, and a virgin from all stain of sin most foreign;" and when Mary is compared with Eve, on which Perrone lays much stress, as being the source of salvation as Eve was of death, all of these and similar statements are to be interpreted in some one of the above senses, and only confirm the position that the specific doctrine was not in the mind or thoughts of the early Church, and fail to render any proof, especially when taken in connexion with the counter testimony.[†]

The early liturgies and offices of the Church are an additional source of evidence. They exalt Mary and her conception; but they do never call it an "immaculate" conception. It is only in the latest years that the term "immaculate" has been introduced into the Western offices of the highest authority. The offices themselves, in honour of the Virgin, did not become current in the West till the eleventh century. In the office for her birth, in the ancient Churches, it is read that "she was *sanctified* from the stain of sin; in one of the German liturgies, "that she was born with a propensity to sin;" in the Roman Church itself, the office spoke of the "*sanctification* of the Virgin." This silence, and the late alteration of these offices, are conclusive as to the non-existence of the dogma.

---

[*] Greg. Naz. Or. 38; John Dam. Fid. orth. iii, 2. See Köllner, Symbolik, 2. 301.

[†] As further specimens of Perrone's citations in evidence, he quotes from a work on the "Sufferings of St. Andrew," of unknown authorship, the expression that "the perfect man was born of a stainless virgin;" from Dionysius of Alexandria, that Mary "is the sole daughter of life," "the house of God;" from Hippolytus, that Christ sprung "from incorruptible wood;" from Origen, "the worthy, immaculate virgin," who "did not bring forth fruit in lust;" from Ephræm, "immaculate, unperverted, and most chaste of all;" and the like. These, with the above, are his strongest passages, and they show the hopelessness of the attempt to find the doctrine in the Christian fathers.

In the year 791 (al. 796) a council was held at Friuli, (Concilium Forojuliense,) called by Paulinus, (Paulus,) patriarch of Aquileia, during the pontificate of Adrian I., to consider the Trinity and the Incarnation, in respect to the procession of the Holy Spirit, and "Adoptionism," that is, the opinion maintained by Archbishop Elipandus of Toledo, and others, that Christ in his human nature was the Son of God only by "adoption." A long and explicit Confession of Faith was published by this council, in the course of which it is said: "*Solus enim sine peccato natus est homo*, quoniam solus est incarnatus de Spiritu Sancto et immaculata Virgine novus homo. Consubstantialis Deo Patri in sua, id est, divina; consubstantialis etiam matri, *sine sorde peccati*, in nostra, id est, humana natura."[*] If the belief in the immaculate *conception* of the virgin had been any part of the orthodoxy of the times, it would have been impossible for a council to have spoken in this way of Christ, as "*alone born without sin*;" and the "immaculateness" ascribed to the Virgin cannot possibly, in the connexion, be interpreted of her conception, or even of her birth; for, if it could, then Christ could not be said to be the "only" one of men *born* without sin.

The testimony of the early bishops of Rome we omit for the present. The only conclusion to be derived from the argument of tradition, so far as the first eight or nine centuries of Christian history are concerned, is that the dogma is unknown. And on the ground of tradition, this silence is conclusive. For tradition demands "universality" of belief; it demands that the doctrine be traced, "in continual succession," to Christ and the apostles. Its formula is, "Quod semper, quod ubique, quod ab omnibus creditum est." And on this ground, silence for eight hundred years is condemnation.[†]

How does the case, now, stand in the mediæval Church? The

---

[*] See Harduin, Acta Conciliorum, 1714, tom. iv, p. 856, C.

[†] Launoy's Second Præscription declares, (p. 11:) "If the Church should wish to explain and solve the matter of the conception of the Virgin in the way just mentioned, (that is, in accordance with the rules of Vincens of Lirens,) and to put the end of the discussion A. D. 1300, it would, without doubt, decree that the blessed Virgin, like the rest of mankind, was conceived in original sin." Melchior Canus, one of the most illustrious Roman Catholic divines of the eighteenth century, one of the most eminent members of the Council of Trent, sent by the University of Salamanca, of whom the Roman Catholic Church historian, Dr. Ritter, of Breslau, in his Church History, 4th edition, 1851, vol. ii, p. 276, says, that "of all the writers of his time he obtained the greatest renown," in his "Loci Theologici," published 1563 and often afterward, declares: "That all the holy fathers who have spoken of the point, have asserted with one voice, that the blessed Virgin was conceived in original sin."

amount of the argument, and the result of the testimony here are, that the doctrine was first invented in the twelfth century, that it was opposed by the greatest and best of the scholastics, and that it made its way, in spite of this opposition, through the force of popular superstition, and from the necessary working out of the inherent tendencies of a system of creature-worship. Some of the mediæval testimony we have already adduced; we add only the most important citations.

Anselm, (1070,) though cited for the Immaculate Conception, teaches in his "Cur Deus Homo," (ii. 16,) that Mary was *conceived* in sin; "Virgo tamen ipsa, unde assumptus est, est *in iniquitatibus concepta, et in peccatis concepit eam mater ejus, et cum originali peccato nata est,* quoniam et ipsa in Adam peccavit, in quo omnes peccaverunt." See also the close of this chapter, and the next (17).[*]

Bernard, in the very beginning of the controversy, (1140,) in the Epistle to the Canons of Lyons, says, in addition to what we have already cited: "If, then, she could neither be sanctified before her conception, since she did not then exist, nor in it on account of the sin which was inherent in the act, it remains that she must have received sanctification while yet existing in her mother's womb, which, excluding sin, made her nativity holy, but not her conception also."

The "Four Books of Sentences" of Peter Lombard, "master of sentences," bishop of Paris, 1159 to 1164, were the theological textbook of the middle ages, upon which all the great scholastics made their comments and built their systems. He says of the flesh of Mary, which our Lord assumed, that it was "previously obnoxious to sin, like the other flesh of the Virgin, but by the operation of the Holy Spirit it was cleansed." "The Holy Spirit, coming into Mary, purified her from sin, and from all desire of sin."[†]

Alexander of Hales, the irrefragable doctor, also a Franciscan, taught in England and Paris, 1230–1245; his testimony is explicit:

---

[*] Also, "she was sanctified by the Holy Ghost," (De Conceptu Virginis, c. xviii:) his words cited by Duns Scotus, that, "nempe decens est, ut ea puritate, qua major sub Deo nequit intelligi, virgo illa niteret," refer in the connexion only to her sanctification before the conception of Christ. See Köllner, Symbolik, 2, s. 301. This passage is also adduced by Perrone; it is taken from the 18th chapter of Anselm's work on the "Conception." Perrone argues, that this must refer to her purity of conception; but this is simply an addition to the text, and contrary to the above citation. Anselm further, in his "Book on the Excellence of the Virgin," says: "We certainly hold that her heart had been so cleansed from all hereditary or actual sin, which, perhaps, was still present in her, that the Holy Spirit, in all his fulness, rested in her."

[†] Liber Sent., bk. iii, dist. iii.

"It was necessary that the blessed Virgin in her generation should contract sin from her parents;" "she was sanctified in the womb."*

Bonaventure, the seraphic doctor, the glory of the Franciscans, who died in 1274, and was canonized in 1482, is exhaustless in the praise of Mary in his "Speculum" and "Corona." To him is attributed the "Psalter" of Mary, to which we have already referred, though probably without sufficient ground. He sanctions her veneration in the most rapturous terms. Yet, on this question he is also decided, explicitly declaring "that the sanctification of the Virgin was *after* she had contracted original sin;" she was "sanctified in the womb." (Lib. iii, dist. iii, p. 1, qu. 2, 3.) Albertus Magnus, who taught in Cologne 1260 to 1280, made the same avowals.

Bonaventure was the pupil of Alexander of Hales, Albertus Magnus of Bonaventure, and next succeeds the greatest of all the scholastic theologians, Thomas Aquinas, "the angelic doctor," who died in 1274, was canonized in 1323, and in 1567 was declared by Pius V. to be "teacher of the Church." In his "Summa Theologiæ, p. iii, qu. 27, art. 1, it stands, "Mary was sanctified in the womb." Art. 2. "*Not before the infusion of the soul;* for if she had been she would not have incurred the stain of original sin, and would not have needed the redemption of Christ." Art. 3. The complete deliverance from original sin was only given her when she conceived Christ: "ex prole redundaverit in matrem, totaliter fomite subtracto." About the festival of the Conception, he says, "that the Roman Church does not observe it herself, yet it tolerates the custom of other Churches. Unde talis celebritas non est totaliter reprobanda."

Such is the testimony of the most eminent mediæval divines, to which we need not add names of less weight. Perrone feels the difficulty arising from this source so "anxiously," that he devotes a whole chapter to its elucidation. What he advances amounts to the following positions: that if these scholastic divines had reasoned correctly from what they conceded about the birth of the Virgin, they would have made her conception immaculate; also, that what they teach can all be best explained in harmony with the doctrine; or, if not so, that they taught what they did as "private teachers;" as also, that they were ignorant of antiquity; and again, that their views on original sin were such as allowed them to speak as they did; in fine, that they did not have any guidance from an infallible decision in what they uttered; and that while they were wrangling in the schools, the dogma was making its way among the people. All of which goes to show, that the mediæval *testimony* is against

---

* Summa Theol., p. iii, qu. 10, memb. 2, art. 1, 4, cf. Gieseler.

it; that, as far as the middle ages are concerned, only isolated opinions are for the doctrine, and the weight of authority is against it. And yet, in tradition, the decision can only be by *authority.*

The only distinct argumentative attempt which Perrone makes to parry the force of their authority and arguments, is the assertion, that these doctors of the schools, when they speak of the conception of Mary, have reference to what he calls the first, or active conception, and not to the passive, or the infusion of the soul into the seed. But this explanation is irrelevant, for two reasons; one is, that many of these doctors do not make this distinction, and, of course, they include both parts of the conception in their statement. They make the distinction between "conception" and "sanctification," and say, that all that precedes sanctification belongs to the "conception," and is infected with original sin; this, of course, includes the "passive" conception. Another reason that invalidates this mode of explanation is, that some of these doctors do make the very distinction in question, and yet maintain that the whole conception, both active and passive, was in original sin. Thus, Alexander of Hales says, that "the Virgin after her nativity, *and after the infusion of the soul into the body,* was sanctified;" Bonaventure asserts, "that the infusion of grace may have been soon *after the infusion of the soul;*" and Aquinas declares expressly, "that the cleansing can only be from original sin, that the fault of original sin can only be in a rational creature, and, therefore, that *before the infusion of the rational soul,* the Virgin was not sanctified." In fact, this mode of meeting the difficulty can only be carried through, by supposing that the mediæval divines believed that original sin could exist in the mere fleshly material derived from parents, an opinion widely abhorrent to their well-known views.

The argument from tradition, in favour of the new dogma, we think, then, may be classed with the argument from Scripture, so far as conclusiveness goes. It will not bear a single test necessary to a real tradition, even on Roman Catholic grounds: antiquity is silent; in the middle ages the great authorities are divided; and in modern times, as our historical sketch has shown, there have been perpetual contests and divisions. Twenty years ago hardly a single name of eminence among the Roman Catholics of Germany could be found in its favour. Spain, indeed, continued her devotions, but France was indifferent, until the Ultramontane party began to gain power, and to look about for the means of arousing popular feeling in behalf of the Papacy.*

---

* In the light of this historical argument, what shall be said of such assertions as the following, contained in the "Letters Apostolic" of Pius IX., concern-

The third source of proof and argument in respect to the dogma is the theological. This is considered by Perrone in three chapters, in different portions of his work.* Against the doctrine four arguments are adduced: Original sin; Mary's liability to suffering and punishment, which implies sin; the universal need of redemption; and the mode of Mary's conception, namely, that she was born of sinful parents, in concupiscence; Christ alone, according to the unanimous opinion of the fathers, being conceived without lust. Perrone meets these arguments by saying, as to the first, that Mary would have had part in original sin, by descent, if God had not prevented this by the grace with which he endued her soul at the moment of its creation, when it was infused into the body; and, as this was Mary's "privilege," he claims that the argument does not lead to the conclusion that her parents must also have been sinless. Suffering, sorrow, and death, he replies, to the second, do not necessarily imply sin; and, besides, the Roman popes have already decided this point against Bains. In what concerns Mary's need of redemption, he grants that she was in a sense redeemed through Christ's merits, but before she actually came under the infection of sin; by her descent she was under the "obligation" to be sinful, and would have had a part in the common malady, had not, by divine prescience and purpose, her soul been purified through Christ's merits before hereditary sin could actually touch her soul; that is, Mary, in herself considered as one of the race, was liable to original sin, but was kept from it through a peculiar and special application of Christ's merits. This dual sort of original sin and of redemption we shall recur to again. In like way he meets the fourth objection to the dogma, by the position that she was indeed born of sinful flesh and needed redemption, unlike Christ, and had a part in such redemption in the peculiar manner aforesaid.

The theological proofs in favour of the dogma are given by Perrone in the fourteenth chapter of the first part of his work. They all rest on the idea of *congruity*, or fitness,—"that God will choose the better way in all his acts." One of these arguments is from the dignity and office of the divine mother. God had from eternity

---

ing the dogma? that "this doctrine of the Immaculate Conception * * * * *always existed* in the Church as received by our ancestors, and is stamped with the character of a divine revelation. For the Church of Christ, careful guardian and defender of the dogmas deposited with her, *changes nothing* in them, diminishes nothing, *adds* nothing," but only so treats them, that they "may increase only in their own kind—that is, in the *same dogma, the same sense, and the same belief.*" The force of "dogmatic" assertion can surely no further go.

[*] Perrone, p. 54 sq., 102 sq., 146 sq.

predestined her to be the mother of our Lord, and must, of course, determine to endow her with all needed grace and graces, since she was to be his own habitation; he would not, then, have allowed her to be defiled, even for an instant, with original sin: this, and this alone, is fitting, congruous. Mary's respective relations to the Three Persons of the Trinity demand the same, from the congruity of the case: of one who was to be the first and most beloved of all created beings, the bride of the Spirit, the mother of God, to be united to the Son, to be the "mother of all living," we cannot conceive it to be possible that she would have been allowed to be infected by sin and guilt. These arguments, Perrone thinks, come near to being "a strict proof;" and he urges them with great plausibility against those who maintain, on the same ground of fitness alone, and without Scripture, that Mary was sanctified in the womb, is the queen of heaven, the mother of all that live, and who pay her devout worship. And it does lie in the very necessity of the case, that all such must logically go on to the dogma of the Immaculate Conception. Mary cannot, in consistency, be worshipped and lauded as she is by all Papists, unless she be free from the defilement of our common nature. The worship of the Virgin leads to this result. In leading thereto, it tramples under foot all tradition, is hostile to Scripture, is irrational; but still it leads to this result. On Protestant grounds, we say, that this is the only consistent position for the worshipper of the Virgin. May it yet be the means of leading many to see the delusion and falsity of the whole system.

On Protestant grounds, on grounds of Scripture and reason, too, we add, that this argument from "congruity" is absolutely worthless. The point to be proved by any argument in the case is the *fact* that the Virgin Mary was conceived without sin; the argument from congruity cannot reach the fact; it can, at the utmost, prove the possibility. The fact is one which only Omniscience could know, which God alone can reveal; and to propound it as "a doctrine of faith" on any such ground of possible fitness is an insult to the word of God. It exalts the unscriptural dogma of the Immaculate Conception at the expense of the Scriptural truths of original sin, and of the universal need of Christ's merits. It is just as easy to prove a good deal more by this "fitness," namely, that Mary could not have fitly been a member of a lost race, that she could not be fitly introduced into a sinful world in the way of natural descent, and the like.

There is one other position into which the new dogma forces the Roman pontiff, which puts the matter of Papal infallibility in a disagreeable dilemma and dualism. The decree of Pius IX. is in opposition to the express declarations of preceding pontiffs; pope is

arrayed against pope; infallibility is discordant with infallibility. Not only has "a probable opinion become improbable," but Peter's chair is divided against itself; and how, then, can that kingdom stand? The Jansenist Launoy, in his Præscriptions, has collected the opinions adverse to, or irreconcilable with, the dogma, of seven of the successors of St. Peter, who never change. From Pope Leo, (440–461,) the greatest and most learned of the early bishops of Rome, he cites four passages in which Leo declares that Christ alone "was innocent in his birth," alone was "free from original sin," and that Christ received from his mother "her nature, but not her fault;" and he asserts that Mary obtained "*her own purification through her conception of Christ.*" This is wholly adverse to the dogma. Innocent III., who called the Lateran Council in 1213, in a sermon on the "Assumption of Christ," comparing Eve and Mary, writes: "Illa fuit sine culpa producta, sed in culpa produxit; hæc autem fuit *in culpa producta*, sed sine culpa produxit." Gregory says, (590–604,) "John the Baptist was conceived in sin; Christ *alone* was conceived without sin." Innocent V., (1276,) in his "Commentary on the Master of Sentences:" "Non convenit tantæ Virgini ut *diu morata sit* in peccato;" and he adds "that she was sanctified quickly after the animation, (that is, of the body by the soul,) *although not in the very moment.*" This is directly against the dogma. John XXII. or Benedict XII., (c. 1340,) says that Mary "passed at first *from a state of original sin* to a state of grace." Clement VI., (1342–1352,) "I suppose, according to the common opinion as yet, that the blessed Virgin was in original sin" *modica morula*, "because, according to all, she was *sanctified* as soon as she could be *sanctified.*"

Thus the papacy, in committing itself to this new and idolatrous dogma, is in hostility to Scripture, to universal consent, and also to itself.

It explains the sense of Scripture by tradition; and it explains the sense of tradition by an infallible expositor; and that infallible expositor contradicts itself.

The new dogma makes the whole of the early Church to have been ignorant of a truth which is now declared to be necessary to the faith; it makes Leo, Innocent III., Innocent V., and Clement V., to have taught heresy; it puts the greatest scholastic divines under the ban; and while doing this it declares that what is now decreed has always been of the faith of the Church, and that it is a part of the revelation of God, given through Christ and the apostles, and handed down by constant succession and general consent.

The "Letters Apostolic," sent forth by Pius IX. to define the faith

in this matter, are composed in a style which, to a correct taste, must appear turgid and overwrought. Repetitions abound; the vocabulary of epithets and symbols is profusely spent in exalting the praise of the Virgin. There is none of the simplicity of faith, nothing of such a mode of teaching as would alone befit an authentic oracle. It is adulation, panegyric, in parts, almost rhapsody. It adopts and rehearses the most exalted strains and ejaculations of ecstatic mystics. It is not argument, but encomium and assertion. It repeats most fully and confirms the Constitutions of Alexander VII., in his "Sollicitudo Omnium Ecclesiarum," 3 Dec., 1661. Into the evidence from early tradition it enters only in the way of allusion and assumption. Upon some of its wonderful assertions we might comment, did our space permit; but we need only quote them to make manifest how utterly devoid of evidence they are. The ineffable God "followed her [Mary] with so great love before all creatures, that in *her alone* he pleased himself with a most benign complacency." "Which original innocence of the august Virgin," "comprehended in the deposit of divine revelation," the Catholic Church "has *never ceased* to lay down, to cherish, and to illustrate." Following the most unnatural allegories of the fathers, this decree makes the "ark of Noah," the "ladder of Jacob," the "burning bush," the "fenced garden," the "city of God," and the "temple of God," to be types, "preannunciations" of the dignity and spotless innocence of Mary. It says that she is "the spotless dove," "the holy Jerusalem," "the exalted throne of God," "the queen who came forth entirely perfect *from the mouth of the Most High*," "the crown of all miracles." In yet loftier strains she is described as "the reparatrix of her parents, the vivifier of posterity," "always conversant with God, and united with him in an eternal covenant;" she is "more beautiful than beauty, more gracious than grace, more holy than holiness, and *alone holy;*" "God alone excepted, she is superior to all, and by nature fairer, more beautiful and more holy than the cherubim and seraphim; she whom all the tongues of heaven and earth do not suffice to extol." She is the "most faithful helper of all who are in danger, and the most powerful mediatrix and conciliatrix with the only-begotten Son of the whole world," "the most illustrious glory and guardian of the holy Church," has "destroyed all heresies," "snatched from the greatest calamities of all kinds the faithful people and nations;" and it is she also who is to "effect by her most powerful patronage" the triumphs and dominion of the Church. "Standing at the right hand of the only-begotten Son, she intercedes most powerfully and obtains what she asks, and cannot be frustrated." Are these the words of truth and soberness? Is this the gospel for

this nineteenth century of strife and infidelity? Has Rome changed? Is superstition extinct? Is the Roman Church the Church of Christ, or of Mary?

While these and similar statements are abhorrent to Scripture, destitute of proper evidence, and indicative of the idolatrous veneration of a creature, yet it is the new dogma itself, in its proper dogmatic contents, which is worthy of the most especial consideration. Destitute of sufficient evidence, without basis in Scripture, and opposed to tradition, it also contains in itself contradictory and unreconciled elements, which evince its falsity and unreasonableness. It is thus not only opposed to the past, but self-destroyed.

And, in the first place, it contains contradictory elements in what it asserts about Mary's exemption from original sin, since it declares that this exemption was "in virtue of the merits of Jesus Christ, the Saviour of mankind." According to Scripture, Christ died for the human race, lost and subject to sin through the transgression of Adam. His merits as Redeemer cannot be applied, nor be supposed to be applied, to any who have not a part in the "*vitium originis*" of the human family. He died for sin, and for that alone; his redemption is from sin, and from that alone. If Mary was preserved through his merits, it must have been that she had in some way a part in the sin of the race.

In reply to this, it is said, and Perrone argues, that she was indeed redeemed through the blood of Christ, but in a peculiar way, in a "higher method," (p. 114, sq.) "A man may be liberated, either by the payment of the debt after he is imprisoned, or before;" in the latter case he is not actually put into prison: so was Mary redeemed through Christ. Such is the mode of explanation common to the defenders of the dogma, to avoid this fatal difficulty; but it rests on a mere metaphor, and does not reach the heart of the objection. In the case supposed, the man is really and personally under the debt, the obligation to pay, though he has not yet suffered the consequences of non-payment, that is, the imprisonment. If he were not personally under this obligation, there would be no sense in saying that the debt could be paid for him. Just so must it be, by parity of reasoning, in the case of Mary. There is no propriety in asserting that she was personally delivered through Christ's merits from original sin, unless she be considered as personally under its power and obligation; and if she be so, then she has a part in the fault of the race. Nor is the difficulty avoided by saying, as Perrone sometimes does, that she was "exempted" before she was under its power, for she could not be personally exempted, unless it had a hold upon her personally; and by saying that she was exempted

through Christ's merits, it is involved and implied that *she* was exempted; and through Christ's merits she could not be exempted from something in which she had no part; and Christ's merits exempt only from sin.

Thus the dogma, in declaring that Mary had no original sin, and yet was redeemed by Christ, contains contradictory positions.

In the second place, the dogma is fatally defective in the view of original sin, on which it rests, and with which alone it is consistent. It contains the vital defect, the semi-Pelagianism of the Roman Catholic theology on this point, against which all the Protestant confessions have protested as unscriptural. The Roman Catholic doctrine puts the essence of original sin solely in defect, makes it negative; asserting that it is only the want of that righteousness, in which Adam was created; this is in scholastic usage the "formal" part, or the very essence of original sin. Concupiscence is *not* of the nature of sin. This is the doctrine of original sin, which Perrone expressly lays down, in the opening of his treatise, (pp. 2, 3, sq.,) "that the essence of original sin is in the defect of grace or of original righteousness."[*] This is the only view of the matter with which the dogma of the Immaculate Conception can possibly be reconciled. If this view is false—if original sin, as Protestants hold,[†]

---

[*] The Council of Trent, as is well known, is not explicit in its definition of original sin. Sess. v, 2, declares, that Adam's sin involved the forfeiture of original righteousness on the part of his descendants, and also that sin itself, "the death of the soul," was transmitted. Cat. Rom., 3, 10, 6, avows, that concupiscence was made inordinate in all by the fall. But this concupiscence is not held by that Church to be of the nature of sin; so Bellarmine, de amiss. gratiæ, says, the difference of man after the fall compared with his state "in puris naturalibus" is only as the difference of the "spoliatus a nudo;" and that the corruption of nature is produced only by the loss of supernatural endowments. To the same effect, Möhler in his "Symbolism." This doctrine is in opposition to Augustine, with whom "concupiscence" is of the essence of original sin. (Contra Jul., lib. ii; and Nupt. et Conc., ii, 8.) Anselm brought into vogue the formula, "Nuditas justitiæ debitæ," as giving the essence of original sin; against him is Peter Lombard. Aquinas attempts a reconciliation, by saying that the "defect of original justice is the *formal* cause," and that concupiscence is the "proper matter and substance" of original sin. (Summa. i, 2; qu. 82; art. iii, 1: "Et ita peccatum originale materialiter quidem est concupiscentia, formaliter vero est defectus originalis justitiæ.") Duns Scotus puts the essence in the "privation," and declares it cannot be in the "concupiscence." See Winer, Köllner, Möhler, in their "Symbolisms."

[†] We need not cite many authorities to exhibit the positive Protestant view, avowedly taken and maintained against the Roman view, and which was one of the strongholds of the Reformed systems, vitally connected with their spiritual power. Augsb. Conf.: "After the fall of Adam all men, propagated according to nature, are born with sin; that is, *without* the fear of God, *without* trust in God,

according to the Scriptures, be positive and not negative, and come by descent, then the conclusion is irresistible, that Mary, by descent, must have had a part therein. The dogma of her Immaculate Conception is possible only with a false view of the nature of the "sin of birth." Augustine could not have held it, nor could Aquinas. (See the note below.) The dogma is conceived in a defective notion of original sin.

Yet again, even with this defective view of original sin, the dogma is involved in difficulties and internal conflicts, by what it asserts and implies as to the origin of the soul of Mary. The theory on which it rests is, that Mary's soul was directly created by God. It declares that the Virgin Mary, "at the first instant of her conception," was preserved immaculate. What is meant by "conception" here? It is the so-called "passive conception," or the infusion of the soul into the seed, the union of the soul of Mary with the body, prepared beforehand in the "active conception." Whence, now, this soul? It was "*created.*" The "Letters," in another passage, say that Mary was the "tabernacle *created* by God himself." Pius IX. also cites the formula of Alexander VII. as having "decretive" authority, and that formula declares, "that Mary's soul, at the first instant of *creation and of infusion* into the body," was preserved free from original sin. And this hypothesis of "creatianism" is also the only hypothesis consonant with the doctrine.*

But now put these two positions together, namely, that original sin consists essentially in privation; that is, in the defect of original justice; and that Mary's soul was directly created by God, and we

---

and *with* concupiscence." So the Apology of the Conf. The Conf. Helv. ii, 8: "By sin we understand that native corruption, derived from our first parents, by which we are plunged into depraved concupiscence and averse to good." So the Gallic, Heidelberg and Dort Confessions, and the Conf. and Cat. of West. Assembly. The Articles of the Church of England, IX.: "It is the fault and corruption of the nature of every man * * * whereby man is very far gone from original righteousness, and is of his own nature inclined to evil." So, too, the Article of the Meth. Ep. Church, VII., abridged from that of the Church of England, contains the same positive and negative parts of the doctrine.

* This "creatianism" is the avowed theory of Perrone. On page 1, he states the question to be about her "passive conception; that is, when her soul was created by God for the animation of her body." It is also the view of a large proportion of the Roman Catholic theologians. The vow of the knights of the Spanish order of Calatrava is worthy of being cited in this connexion for its fulness: "In the moment of her blessed conception, and of the union of her soul with her body, divine grace prevented and preserved her from original guilt by the merits of the passion and death of Christ our Redeemer, her future Son, foreseen in the divine counsel, by which she was truly redeemed, and by a more noble kind of redemption than any other of the children of Adam."

arrive at the following difficulties and dilemmas. The position is this: When Mary's soul was created and infused into her body, she was by grace preserved free from original sin. Would the original sin, from which she was kept, have come to her from her body, or from her soul,—for it must have come from one or the other? If you say that it would have come from the soul, that involves the consequence that God usually creates original sin in the soul, before it is united with the body, and, of course, before it is connected with Adam by descent. If you say, on the other hand, that original sin would have come to Mary from her "active conception," that is, from her prepared body, then it was already there, in germ and seed, before the infusion of the soul. God either creates the human soul with original sin, or the original sin is from the parents. If the former, we have original sin without any connexion with Adam; if the latter, Mary must have been really possessed of it. But you say original sin consists in defect, privation, and that the dogma means that God created Mary's soul perfectly holy. But this raises another difficulty; for it is also asserted that he created her thus holy on the ground of Christ's merits, and that had it not been for Christ's merits she would have shared the sin of the race. This creation, now, must have been either through the race (the connexion with Adam) or above the race, either mediate or immediate. If through the race or mediate, then she must have had a part in its sinfulness; if above the race, or an immediate creation, then there is no theological or rational ground for saying that, as far as her creation was concerned, she was liable to sin, or could be saved from it through Christ's merits.

Nor can any relief be found by conjoining the two points, and asserting that the exemption from original sin concerns the time or point of *union* of the soul with the seed, the conjunction of the active with the passive conception. For the still unanswered question here is, and must be, this: In the union of the soul with the body, from which of the two, soul or body, would the original sin have come, if grace had not prevented?—for it must have come from one or the other. If you say from the soul, then you would have original sin without any connexion with Adam; if you say from the body, then original sin must already have been there; if you say from both together, this simply dodges the question, or else resolves original sin into some act consequent upon the union,—that is, into actual transgression.

Nor is the matter helped by saying that original sin is essentially negative, privative; for the privation has respect to either the soul or the body, or to both conjoined, and the same dilemmas result.

The "Letters Apostolic," in other passages, speak of the dogma in this wise: that the "Blessed Virgin was free from all contagion of *body*, soul, and mind;" that she had "community with men only in their nature, but not in their fault;" and that "the flesh of the Virgin taken from Adam did not admit the stain of Adam, and on this account that the most Blessed Virgin was the tabernacle created by God himself, formed by the Holy Spirit." These expressions imply that the fault in the case could have been a fault of "nature;" that the contagion might have been of the "body;" that the "stain from Adam" would, under other circumstances, have come to her through the "flesh." But in her "active conception," before the infusion of the soul and of grace, the "nature," the "body," the "flesh," were already extant, ere the "passive conception" took place: were they with or without the fault? If with the fault, then you have original sin; if without, then it would follow that the flesh, the body, the nature, *before* the passive conception, had been already delivered from the bondage of corruption. In short, if original sin come from the race, from the "active conception," then Mary must have had it; if it come from the "passive conception," then God is its direct author in every individual case.

This dogma of the Immaculate Conception, then, contains contradictory elements; it rests on a false view of original sin. Even with that false view it cannot well be reconciled: it assumes the theory that souls are directly created, and here again it involves itself in inextricable difficulties in relation to original sin. It is opposed to Scripture, to tradition, and it is self-opposed. Yet it comes to us with the sanction and decree of an "infallible" authority, who says, "Let no man interfere with this our declaration, pronunciation, and definition, or oppose and contradict it with presumptuous rashness. If any should presume to assail it, let him know that he will incur the indignation of the Omnipotent God, and of his blessed apostles, Peter and Paul."

Our review of this celebrated controversy and its results furnishes an instructive exemplification of the mode in which Rome develops doctrines. Nothing is clearer in the way of historical testimony than that this dogma is a novelty in the Christian Church; and nothing, too, is more manifest, than that it has been developed into its present form by an inward necessity of the Roman system. Opposed to Scripture, to antiquity, and to great Scriptural truths, it has still followed a law of development. It is the slow and sure eating of the poison which Rome received from a pagan antiquity, in the veneration, the cultus, the worship of that which is not God. This superstition infects the whole system of the Papacy; it belongs

to its essence; it must work itself out to its legitimate results. In doing this it sets at naught the word of God, misinterprets ancient and authentic testimonies, is in conflict with the great truths of original sin and of the universal need of redemption; yet it must still go on in its baleful development. The might of superstition is greater in the Church of the Papacy than the power of truth, than the divine oracles, than the consent of ancient times. And this is the real secret of the growth and present position of this dogma. The voice of superstition, the paganism of Romanism, demand the enthronement of a creature.

The decreed dogma lends the authentic sanction of Rome to that cultus of the Virgin, which has been growing for many centuries, and which, in the "Glories of Mary," had reached its popular culmination. There it is asserted, "that it is morally impossible for those who neglect the devotion to the blessed Virgin to be saved;" "he who is not protected by Mary cannot be saved." Suarez teaches, that "it is the sentiment of the Church that the intercession of Mary is not only useful, but necessary," and "that Christ is never found except through Mary." Liguori also adds that "Mary is a mediatrix of grace," and that "we receive through Mary's intercession all the graces we ask;" that "God *will not* grant his graces without her intercession." "The throne of grace is Mary." "We must go to a sacrament," says M. Olier, in a Catechism approved by Roman bishops, "which is solely of mercy, and wherein Jesus Christ exercises no judgment. This sacrament is the most blessed Virgin. It is through her that we have access to Jesus Christ in full confidence."* "There is and can be no truer test of one's active, living faith in our holy religion, in the redemption and salvation of sinners through the cross, than a firm attachment to the worship of Mary."† "Mary is the channel through which our Lord dispenses his graces, and he dispenses none save through her intercession." And the pope, in his Encyclical of Feb. 2, 1849, says, that God "*would have us possess all through Mary.*"

In this arrogant decree of the supreme pontiff, we read the meaning of the Ultramontane claim of infallibility as centering in the see of Peter. It is the triumph of the Papal over the Episcopal system; it involves the position that the pope alone is the final arbiter of doctrine, that in him is the seat of infallibility. Whether

---

* As quoted by Dr. Pusey on the "Rule of Faith," p. 60, with other citations.

† Brownson's Review, January, 1853. Our own land, by the request of the Sixth Provincial Council of Baltimore, in 1846, has been put, by a formal decree of the General Congregation of the Propaganda, (1847,) under the protection of Mary "immaculate concepta."

this decree will be recognised as having final authority, or whether there is any vestige of the old Gallican liberties left in France, or of Episcopal independence in Germany,—whether the Dominicans will bow their heads in subjection, remains to be seen. The pretension to sole and supreme infallibility cannot be more decidedly advanced than in the words of the "Letters," in the most formal part, when announcing the dogma itself: "We resolved that we should no longer delay to sanction and define by our supreme authority," etc. It involves the pretension to infallibility in matters of fact as well as of doctrine, for this dogma is about a fact. In this omniscient prerogative thus claimed, is yet another instance of the necessary development of the Papal system. To this it must come. The final decision about all spiritual truth must be claimed for and by the successor of Peter. What Scripture means, what tradition is, he is to decide, and he alone in the last resort. What though Scripture be annulled! what though tradition be defied and reversed! it is still an infallible utterance. Though pope speak against pope, the Papacy is infallible. The last pope only needs to say that the others agreed with him, and it is infallibly true, and no private judgment may "think" otherwise. Never has a pope in such an authoritative way, without appeal to him, by his own motion, so distinctly interfered in respect to a religious truth, more boldly proclaimed himself the final arbiter. Divine Providence has permitted and decreed that the inherent tendencies of the Papal system, in respect to both the worship of the creature, and the claim of infallibility, should work themselves out to their utmost verge and culmination together, that it might be most apparent what the Papal system really is.

Infallibility, in this dogma and decree, sets its seal to idolatry. In the person of the pope the two are married. Infallibility stamps a Pagan lie as Christian truth, and thus disproves itself. Is not the decree idolatrous? Read its own words: "The mother of God approaches as nearly to God as created nature can do, and is more exalted than all human and angelic encomiums;" she is "the first and the peculiar work of God;" she is "*alone with her Son* partaker of perpetual benediction;" she "has brought salvation to the world;" she is the "*most illustrious* glory and ornament, and most firm guardian of the Holy Church;" to her it is ascribed that "heresies are destroyed," "all calamities averted," and even that "the sinner may obtain pardon;" and the consummation of this adoration is found in the exhortation: "Let all the children of the Catholic Church, with a more ardent zeal of *piety, religion, and love*, proceed to *worship, invoke, and pray to* the most blessed Virgin Mary,

mother of God, conceived without original sin." If this be not idolatry, there cannot be any idolatry. If this be idolatry, then the infallible Papal Church has ceased to be the Church of Christ, and has become the Church of Mary.

And the juncture at which this decree is uttered is also providential. Never were the claims of the Papacy more fully scrutinized, and never has its fatuity been more manifest. It is the dogmatism of an infatuated pride. The nations are in arms; they are hungering for the bread of life. They need Christ, and Rome gives them Mary. They need an almighty helper, and the Papacy gives them a deified woman. The heart of the conflict of Europe, deeper than all its politics, deeper than all its social needs, is in the question between Romanism and Protestantism; between the Church of Christ and the Church of the Papacy; between reason and faith, on the one side, and superstition against reason and Scripture on the other. At such a juncture, the very crisis of its fate, Rome speaks to the listening nations; she sends forth her thousand missives; she calls her archbishops and bishops from afar; in "Letters Apostolic," which once would have inspired, as no other word of mortal man, both faith and fear, she addresses, in the name of God, the nations of the whole earth, which she claims as her rightful heritage, and all the "consolation," all the "hope," all the "succour" which she can offer is to command them to address their prayers unto, and to put their confidence in, the Virgin Mary, conceived without the stain of original sin! "For," says Pius IX., "nothing is to be feared and nothing is to be despaired of under her guidance, under her auspices, under her favour, under her protection!"

Such a decree at such a juncture proves that the day of Rome is past and her doom at hand.

As ever of old, the true Church of Christ, his only bride, which makes not flesh its arm, is to bind closer to her heart the name of him, the only Saviour, whose is the only name given under heaven among men whereby we must be saved. Against the power of infidelity and of superstition, both arrayed in hostility to Christ, his name is the sign and pledge of final victory.

ART. VII.—THE COERCIVE POWER CLAIMED BY THE CHURCH OF ROME.

THE *Civiltà Cattolica* is perhaps the most authoritative journal now published in the interests of the Papacy. Issued at Rome, under the very eye of the pope,—edited by the Jesuits, whose distinctive function it is to maintain the Papal power,—it certainly comes as near to being the pontifical organ as any publication is ever likely to be. Accordingly, its views are generally received with great reverence throughout the Church. Even Romish editors in Protestant lands, where extreme Ultramontane doctrines have (at least until recently) been rarely preached, speak of the *Civiltà* and its utterances with the utmost respect; and when they presume to differ from it, they generally speak with bated breath. In a word, if the pretensions of Rome are likely to be stated anywhere clearly and unreservedly, it is in this journal.

Let our readers now study the following pages, which are carefully translated from the *Civiltà Cattolica*, (No. cxi, 2d series, vol. viii, Nov., 1854, pp. 272–282.) The article is not translated in full; but nothing important to the statement, or which would in any wise alter its meaning, is omitted. The italicizing is our own.

"What are the limits of the power of coercion? There are but two, which, in fact, comprehend all others, viz., *means* and *aim*, which limit all human activities: as, for instance, man has no wings, he never aims at flying—at least so long as the great problem of aëronautics is unsolved:—and here, for want of means, the aim is not devised. On the other hand, a sower does not need for his work a doctor's hat or a soldier's arms: as, on the contrary, the soldier does not seek to fight with a hoe, or the doctor with a plough. And in this way, the act of governing, like all other acts, is limited and determined by its means and its end. Avveduti goes too far, in fact, when he claims for the superior power *unlimited* authority.*

"There are, undoubtedly, many cases in which the superior power is unduly exercised, and in which, nevertheless, subjects are bound to obey, though unable to understand the aims of the higher power or the fitness of its means of reaching them. But there are a

---

* It will be clearly seen from what follows, that this disclaimer refers, *not* to the power of the Church, but to that of secular governments. According to the Jesuits, the Church alone has unlimited power: unlimited, that is, by any human will, law, or constitution.—ED.

thousand cases in which the subject is *not* bound to obey, because the superior power is incompetent to command. And as the governing power is thus limited, so also is the penal function, or right to punish. The CHURCH, too, like every other judge, must inquire *how far her means extend*, and what degree of severity her *end* requires.*

"What then are the limits of the Church's means? There are none, except the limits of human power and of the divine assistance by which the Church is comforted. As the Church commands the spiritual part of man directly, (direttamente agli spirito,) *she therefore commands the whole man, and all that depends on man:* for it is the property of man to live according to the spirit, according to reason.† This is the efficient cause of that wonderful power which the Church has always exercised (though under many different forms) in this world; which she exercises still; and which is so incomprehensible to mere worldly politicians. She was but a babe in the cradle in Palestine, when she attached in the Sanhedrim the chiefs of that people whose inextinguishable vitality has for two thousand years been the puzzle of the philosophers. From the darkness of the Catacombs she dictated laws to the subjects of the emperors, *abrogating decrees, whether plebeian, senatorial, or imperial, when in conflict with Catholic ordinances.* Emerging from the Catacombs to rule over the Roman world, she led the autocrats by the hand in reforming their statute-books and their administration. Did they resist? The Church, *unyielding, saw them thrown at her feet, either penitent or crushed.* When the barbarians came down, like a torrent, from the north, the Church taught them Christian civilization, and patronized both, peoples and princes. When Mohammedan license rushed in from the East, it was the Church that hurled against it the lances of Christendom. Did the Christian emperors become insolent? *The Church armed against them their very electors.* To every rampant heresy the Church *knew how to oppose the power either of the peoples or of their princes;* and when these supports seemed at last to have been snatched from her by a universal rationalism, behold! there is a sudden turning

---

* Notice the significant terms of this proposition. The question is not, in the mind of the Jesuit, "What is the true power intrusted to the Church?" but, "What are the *means* at the disposal of the Church?" and "what *severity* does she demand?"—Ed.

† This proposition sums up the entire claim of the Church, both as to temporal and spiritual supremacy. The *absolute* direction of the soul logically and necessarily carries with it, as the greater the less, the direction also of the body.—Ed.

back of both:—of the nations, fearing an unbridled royal power, and proclaiming the necessity of a supreme spiritual power; of the princes, beginning to understand, at the light of a bloody communism, that the principles of the Church *are a firmer foundation for their thrones* than bayonets, which must always be intrusted to a part *of the people.*

"Thus, amid all formal changes the power of the Church is always immense. If any doubt it, let them listen to her enemies, who, for so many years, have been proclaiming that 'the Church is dead;' 'that she remains only as an empty and impotent shadow.' They would not vaunt thus against a mere nonentity: the fearless do not boast. The truth is, that the only power dreaded by the demagogues and the ungodly is that very Church which they unite in attacking, calling it 'clerical party,' 'Jesuitism,' 'theologism,' or what not. And they are right in that fear. To-day, as in all times, the Church commands the spiritual part of man (lit. *the spirits;*) and in ruling over the spirit, she rules the body, rules our riches, our sciences, our affections, our interests, our associations—*rules, in fine, over monarchs and their ministers.* She rules over them like Divine Providence, not with an arbitrary absolutism, but by the force of truth and right, *cum magna reverentia disponens.* Petty politicians may conclude that the Church has lost her power, because she does not enlist artillery, cavalry, and infantry; but the *truth* is, that the *artillery, cavalry, and infantry of the Catholics are in the hands of the Church, inasmuch as in her hands are the mind, the reason, and the power of every true Catholic.*

"So far, then, as the *means* are concerned, the Church finds *no limit to her use of penal justice,* as she does not demand impossibilities from man, nor miracles from Providence. But there may be a limit found in her *aim,* if those actions only fall under the spiritual authority which are necessary for a spiritual aim. Here, then, we have to inquire, (1.) Whether a penal right is necessary to spiritual ends? and, (2.) Within what limits may severity be used to reach such ends? With regard to the first question, there cannot be a shadow of doubt. Is not the end of *all* punishment essentially spiritual? Take away from chastisement its moral relations to guilt and amendment, and you reduce it to mere misfortune. What is the difference between the martyr who falls by the axe, the traveller slain by an assassin, and the culprit who dies under the sentence of the law? Take away from the first case the faith and innocence of the victim, and from the third the guilt of the criminal and the justice of the court, and wherein do they differ from the second? Punishment, therefore, has, *essentially,* spiritual aims; so that those

Febronians[*] who advocate the separation of Church and State, *and question the competency of the Church* in the matter of penal justice, should rather question whether *punishment can properly belong at all to the temporal power.* We, who repudiate that Utopian separation, concede to governments the use of moral acts and force, and consequently, also, a true right to punish. But *how much more* must we claim it for the Church, as it properly belongs *entirely* to the spiritual order? All the arguments of our opponents may be summed up in one, viz.: that spiritual acts cannot be compelled by external force. But *this sophism* includes two errors, of which the first is, that the Church ought to confine herself to acts which are spiritual in their *entity.* But when we speak of the Church as a spiritual power, imposing spiritual acts, we do not speak of their entity, but of their *aim;* and the power of the Church, and the acts commanded by her, are called spiritual, because they have spiritual ends, (as above explained,) although done in material things and by material (*materiati*) men. The second error lies in assuming that punishment aims directly to produce a spiritual act, which, on the contrary, it can only effect indirectly. Its direct aim is to afflict the sensitive part of man, and thus make him abandon the occasion of the affliction. This aim being a moral one, there is nothing to exclude it from the competency of the Church.[†]

"Our second question was, (To what extent) *may the Church make use of severity? Here also we answer, that the aim, of itself, does not impose any limits.* For, as the spiritual good is the greatest of all goods, therefore everything, allowed for other smaller goods, must be allowed for the greatest. And as it is a universal law of punishment that the infliction be not greater than necessary, nor less than sufficient, *the spiritual authority must be entitled, a fortiori, to everything conceded to the temporal power.*

"The conclusion is, therefore, *that there are no limits to the exercise of the coercive power of the Church, either in view of her means, or of her aim.*

"If we find no limits in the means of the Church to forbid her

---

[*] The Jansenists and liberal Catholics of Germany were called *Febronians,* from Justin Febronius, (Hontheim,) who wrote a work, *De Statu Ecclesiæ* et *legitima potestate Rom. pontificis,* (Frankfort, 1763–74, 4 parts, 4to.,) which has been several times reprinted, abridged, and translated.—Ed.

[†] Mr. Chandler, in his recent speech in Congress, denies, indignantly, that the "power of the pope extends one grain beyond his spiritual relations with the members of his Church." How easily and irresistibly does the Jesuit's logic in the text bring *all* possible relations within the category of spiritual ones for those who admit the infallibility of the Church!—Ed.

the use of a just severity in punishing, let us now see whether we can derive such a limit from the spirit with which the Saviour has comforted her in proportion with the aim for which she was established by him. Here, indeed, is the great battle-field whereon our adversaries plant in array all their forces, drawing forth from their arsenals everything they know of and do not know of, to show that the Church, as a pious mother, must not get angry or provoke the indignation of her sons.* This custom of playing the schoolmaster, with reference to the Church, has become very common now-a-days, and even Catholics sometimes do not shrink from taking part in it, not considering how much such an arrogance is unbecoming every subject, and that it is irreligious and impious, if declared against a superior, appointed and guided by the Divine Paraclete.†

"But if the Church is a pious mother, she is not on that account a stupid one; she will not, in order to obtain from her children a kiss, a caress, or a flattery, let them uncautiously break their necks. The Church, if full of compassion, is also the bride of that Divine Spirit which admonishes the parent that really loves his child not to spare the rod. These writers cannot, without turning Protestants, arrogate to themselves the right to teach the Church the true sense of the gospel, and the duties of Christian meekness. If our adversaries would bring forward only philosophic reasons to show that the Church has no penal right, they might be wrong; but they would not thereby make themselves ridiculous. But when we see a physician or a lawyer, dressed up and perfumed, coming from a coffee-saloon, after losing a few games at billiards, and enjoying himself with punch and ice, and commencing a sermon on Christian meekness against the priest-party, then, indeed, in order to keep from laughing, we have to recollect that the man curses like a Turk, and disguises himself like a hypocrite. Away, gentlemen; if you are Catholics, revere the Church, and learn from her what are the just limits of Christian meekness, between the stupidity which punishes nothing, and anger which seeks, not the amendment of the culprit and the preservation of social order, but satisfaction of passion. If you are heretics, confess it freely, and we shall know how to judge

---

* Nuytz, p. 72. [Nuytz is the well-known Professor of Canonical Law at the University of Turin, whose work on *Jus Canonicum* was put into the Index, because it confines the right of the Church to merely spiritual affairs. The bishops of Sardinia demanded his removal from his chair, which was, however, refused by the state government.—Ed.]

† It is with such gentle rebukes that the Gallicans must constantly put up in these days of Ultramontanism and Jesuitism. Yet Mr. Chandler appears to believe that Gallicanism is Romanism!—Ed.

of your interpretations of the gospel, and will answer you: *Ne sutor ultra crepidam,* (shoemaker, stick to your last.)

"*We leave it, then, to the Church to determine to what extent she can or must be severe.* She has spoken long since, she has declared that she never will be reduced to shed the blood of her enemies any more than that of her children. But if a Catholic government, desirous of preserving among its subjects those sentiments of religion and that honesty of conscience which secure obedience to the laws, *reliance upon one's word, honesty to contracts, inviolability of marriages, peace to families,* honour to the citizens, assistance to the wretched, and, in general, all those duties on which depend happiness and social order, *should declare that the duties of a Catholic are regarded as a law of the state, and that an infringement upon them is to be punished as an infringement upon this law; then, certainly, it belongs to the Church to declare to what extent Catholicism has been offended, of which she alone can be a competent judge; but she will leave it to the lay judge to determine the punishment in the civil order.*

"This, however—may the enemies of the Church remember it—*this is voluntary moderation on the part of the Church, not a right conceded to anybody* to check her. The Church is meek, because this is her spirit, *not as if she, being a spiritual society, has no* RIGHT TO PUNISH, EVEN WITH BLOOD OR WITH DEATH. The synagogue was a spiritual society, and established by the same God who afterward substituted for it the Church—a God of infinite goodness in establishing the first as well as in substituting the second. Now the synagogue did not shrink from dealing with the sword, and from those first Levites who sanctified for the Lord their right hand, cutting down the fornicators, down to those last Maccabean priests who, by killing the idolater at the altar, 'in accordance with the precept of the law,' vindicated for the holy people the liberty of their temple and sacrifices, there extends a series of formidable punishments ordered by the Spirit of God, and apt to convey quite another idea of divine goodness and the right of spiritual society, than that which the slanderers of the Church and apostles of philanthropy would like to canonize. According to them, every material punishment, every material coercion, is interdicted to the Church; and because she is a spiritual society, the material means of coercion are not allowed. Then only will it be allowed to her when she has got the means from the civil government. Ah! then, to be sure, the scruples of Christian meekness lose their stings, and their gospel finds no difficulty in fashioning itself after the state law.

EPILOGUE.

"You see, reader, how inconsistent those are who, presupposing the right of man to confer a coercive power to an authority, deny it to the Church, who is the most voluntary of all associations; inconsistent, if worshipping a primitive Church fashioned by their own imagination, they wish to force the Church to have recourse to the princes who were the oppressors of the primitive Church; inconsistent, if professing to be Catholics, they refuse the dogmatic *Bulls* which, for centuries, the whole Church has accepted; inconsistent, if recognising the imperishableness of the pure Church, they wish to deprive her of the means to be imperishable; inconsistent, *if* recognising the proneness of human wickedness to trample under foot reason and faith, *they pretend that the Church ought to reduce human passion to order by those spiritual means which have a worth only for reason and faith;* inconsistent, *if* confessing finally, from despair, that the Church may excommunicate the obstinate, *they pretend that the excommunication does not produce its natural effects, and thus that they need not accept the smaller afflicting punishments;* inconsistent, if recognising in the Church the right to hurl her excommunication against the obstinate, to permit, at the same time, the obstinate to annul the excommunication; inconsistent, if professing to be obedient sons and disciples of the Church, they arrogate to themselves to teach the Church the true spirit of the gospel, which they have to learn from her:—in short, everything in them is inconsistency. And must not man be inconsistent, if he revolt against God? They are inconsistent, whether as philosophers or theologians, as lawyers or canonists, as libertines or royalists, as philanthropists or stoics, as Catholics or heretics. They are in a labyrinth, from which there is no outlet.

"If they wish to find their way out of it, let them show that the Church may sustain herself as an external and visible society, without attempts on the part of human passions to disturb the external order; or let them suggest efficient and sufficient means to change the nature of human passions, always prone to extravagance, without requiring a reaction on the part of society. Until we find this out, *we shall have to allow the Church to use those means, without which she cannot subsist, and to make each one who does not listen to authority and reason, listen to the impression of a sensible punishment.*"

ART. VIII.—SHORT REVIEWS AND NOTICES OF BOOKS.

(1.) THE General Conference of the Methodist Episcopal Church, at its session in 1848, requested the Rev. Dr. Elliott to write a history of the Church from 1844 to 1848, authorizing him to have "access to all the journals and documents of the Church" that might be necessary. In going at his work Dr. Elliott found himself everywhere confronted with slavery, and therefore took up the discussion of that subject in two preliminary volumes on "The Sinfulness of American Slavery," which appeared in 1850, and were noticed in this journal, (vol. xxxiv, p. 311,) as containing a "complete repertory of facts and arguments on the subject of slavery in its relations to the moral law." Pursuing the discussion with the same exhaustless faculty of labour, the author now presents us with the "*History of the Great Secession from the Methodist Episcopal Church in the Year* 1845, *eventuating in the Organization of the New Church, entitled the Methodist Episcopal Church, South.*" (Cincinnati: Swormstedt & Poe, 1855; large 8vo., pp. 1144.) In preparing this volume the writer has lost sight of no work, pamphlet, or even newspaper article of any value, bearing on the question. The account given in the preface of the method on which the work has been done, and of the labour spent upon it, would delight the heart of a thorough-bred German professor of the old school. The "standpoint" of the book is given in the following words:—

> "The Methodist Episcopal Church, South, in these pages is called 'a secession from the Methodist Episcopal Church,' and the word secession is used in its plain, simple meaning, of a separation from the Methodist Episcopal Church, by the sole act of the seceders themselves, without authority, sanction, or approval by the Methodist Episcopal Church. It cannot be considered, we believe, other than a *violent* secession, originating without necessity or adequate cause, carried on by wrong measures, pleaded for by raising fallacious issues, and when completed comprising several dangerous elements. The Methodist Episcopal Church, South, stands, therefore, in the same relation to the Methodist Episcopal Church, and to the British Wesleyans, that the Methodist Protestant Church, and the followers of Mr. Scott in America, and other Methodist bodies in Europe do. The parent bodies do not stand in antagonism to these new bodies; though they do not become identified with them any more than with other Protestant Churches. Nevertheless, it is readily conceded, that a secession from a Church may be justifiable, when based on Scriptural principles, when conducted in a Christian manner, and when it is calculated to promote the salvation of souls. Our southern brethren attempt to make these pleas, and they maintain that their cause is just. Thus the Methodist Episcopal Church, and the Methodist Episcopal Church, South, are now at issue. In the following pages we have endeavoured to present the truth of history. Yet we do not forget that we are identified with the Methodist Episcopal Church so intimately that our version of the whole will admit of scrutiny. We expect this scrutiny, and intend to meet it, by admitting errors whenever clearly pointed out; and leaving all the means of detection in the materials which we have deposited in a safe place to be used for this, as well as for other purposes."

As to the propositions that have been made for changing the present general rule on slavery, Dr. Elliott expresses himself as follows:—

> "Some suppose the Methodist Episcopal Church itself is in rather a perilous condition in regard to slavery. A few persons in her pale are disposed to rem-

edy the supposed evil by changing the General Rule on slavery, and make other changes to correspond to this. We are persuaded the principles of the Discipline on slavery cannot be changed, and that the present Rule, which is the same in substance as that adopted in 1784, is preserved to this day by no material variation from the original type. For the temporary and inconsiderate essay at one time to exclude all slaveholders never was established; just because it attempted an impossibility, and fixed on an unjust standard under the circumstances. The only thing that could now be done would be to place in the section on slavery a literal *explanation* of the General Rule. It is clear that the word *enslave*, in the Rule, does not mean to reduce free persons to slavery, just because neither buying nor selling, which the Rule includes, can take place till a person is first deprived of his liberty. Then in applying the Rule in any case of trial, there are two facts to be ascertained. The first, Has the person bought or sold? This being ascertained, the next fact is, Has liberty been accomplished by this act, either immediately or prospectively? If it has not, the person is guilty according to the Rule. The only exception to this is, in Methodist principles, where emancipation cannot be secured, that humanity and mercy have been exercised, and cruelty and injustice avoided. Freedom, when possible, is the rule; and in all cases mercy, justice, and right. But no trading in slaves is allowed, except to free or emancipate. The various proposed amendments to the Rule, some of them vague or unmeaning, others of them impracticable or unjust, show clearly that the present Rule is the only one that can stand the test among all the candidates for its place. Whatever additional regulations could be added to the section on slavery, for the more efficient instruction of slaves religiously and intellectually, would also be in place. But those amendments that have been proposed, from the suggestions of the recent abolition school, have little in them calculated to benefit the slaves; while most of them would prove ruinous. Such amendments have, by way of contrast, a sort of offset in the course of the Methodist Episcopal Church, South, which has explained away the General Rule, and excluded the entire section."

We trust that Dr. Elliott's great and valuable labours will be duly appreciated, and that our preachers, and all others interested, will *buy* this volume, and inform themselves thoroughly from it as to the merits of the question.

(2.) "*The World in the Middle Ages*, by A. D. Koeppen, Professor of History in Franklin-Marshall College." (New-York: D. Appleton & Co., 1854; folio, pp. 232.) This belongs to a class of books for which, heretofore, American students have always had to look to Germany. Lest "nativism" should boast too loudly, however, it must be stated that Professor Koeppen is a Dane by birth, and that his education was obtained in lands where the means of culture are far more abundant than they can be in a new country like ours. Whatever else "Know-Nothingism" may accomplish, we hope it will not prevent foreigners like the author of this book, who "know something," from coming "over to help us." The work is a concise but systematic historical geography of the middle ages, giving an account of the origin and development, the institutions and literature, the manners and customs of the nations of Europe, Western Asia and Northern Africa, from the close of the fourth to the middle of the fifteenth century. What is even more important to American students than the text, the work contains six coloured maps, illustrating the political divisions of the world at the six most important epochs of the history. The maps are taken from the historical atlas of Spruner, well known for their painstaking accuracy. If there were no text at all, the maps alone would be worth more than the price of the whole work to students of history. We commend

the work to the attention of all our readers who wish to understand the history of the middle ages; or even that of modern Europe, which rests entirely upon it.

(3.) AMONG all the modern saints of the Church of Rome, there is not one held in higher estimation than Liguori, though his canonization only took place in 1839. His life has been published in various forms; one of the best is, "*The Life of St. Alphonsus Maria de Liguori*," (Baltimore: Murphy & Co., 1855; 12mo., pp. 594,) which is compiled from the one given in the series of "Lives of the Saints," edited by the Fathers of the Oratory in England. It gives copious details of the personal and public history of Alphonsus; setting forth his piety, zeal, asceticism, and success in the most ample, not to say prolix way. The book tells of far more miracles than the Bible does: Christ and his apostles were far more chary of interfering with the order of nature than Liguori, both before and after his death. It is our purpose to present to our readers hereafter a fuller view of the subject, in an article or two on Liguori and his Moral Theology.

(4.) "*The Footsteps of St. Paul*" (New-York: R. Carter & Brothers, 1855; 12mo., pp. 416) is an "attempt at a consecutive history of the great apostle to the Gentiles, adapted for younger students and for general readers." The compiler has made excellent use of the many valuable works that have recently appeared on the subject—especially of Conybeare and Howson's great work—selecting such parts as are adapted for the purpose with much judgment, and weaving them skilfully into a continuous and graphic narration.

(5.) *A Review of Unitarian Views*, by the Rev. H. M. DENISON, A. M." (Louisville: Morton & Griswold, 1854; 12mo., pp. 155.) The "Unitarian Views" alluded to in the title of this excellent little volume were originally set forth in a published report of a committee of the "Conference of Western Unitarian Churches," held at Louisville, May 1, 1854. The conference, believing itself to have no right to issue any statement of belief as authoritative, or "as a declaration of Unitarian faith, other than the New Testament itself," did not adopt the report, but yet so far sanctioned it as to order it to be printed. It rejects the deity of Christ, the humanity of Christ, the deity and personality of the Holy Ghost, the atonement and original sin, and attempts arguments, historical, metaphysical, and exegetical, against all of them. Mr. Denison, in very brief space, shows that the three gentlemen who made the report have, to some extent at least, corrupted history, invented metaphysics, and perverted exegesis, to suit their purpose. The book will furnish an admirable manual to put into the hands of young persons likely to be exposed to Socinian or Arian sophistries.

(6.) IT was a remark of Dr. Dwight, that "the man who should show to common minds the connexion between colleges and the interests of the Church, would be a benefactor to his species." This benefactor has been found, and

has done his work in "*Prayer for Colleges; a Premium Essay*, by W. S. Tyler, Professor of Greek in Amherst College." (New-York: M. W. Dodd, 1855; 12mo., pp. 214.) A benevolent individual, some years ago, placed at the disposal of the Society for the Promotion of Collegiate and Theological Education at the West, the sum of one hundred and fifty dollars, to be given to the author of the best essay on "Prayer for Colleges." A competent committee, after examining thirty-two manuscripts, awarded the prize to Professor Tyler's essay. The "prize" system has seldom brought forth so good a book. It divides the subject into two parts: (1.) Prayer in General; and (2.) Prayer for Colleges. To the first of these the author devotes three chapters of his work, justly remarking that it would be of little avail to present colleges as a special object of prayer, unless Christians in general can be brought to a higher appreciation of the efficacy of prayer than seems now to exist in the Church. The remaining eleven chapters treat of the origin and history of colleges, and their close and inevitable connexion with popular education on the one hand and with the ministry on the other. These topics are set forth with great fulness of knowledge and amplitude of illustration. It is shown, too, that colleges, instead of being hotbeds of vice, as many suppose, are in fact, as their history in this country abundantly shows, nurseries of piety; and that the number of young men "ruined" at college bears no proportion to those "ruined" at home or in the walks of trade. We hope the book will obtain a wide circulation, not only among college men, but among readers of all classes.

(7.) Alexander Carson was in some respects the Ewald of British theologians: his hand was against every man. Like Ewald, too, he brought heavy metal to bear against his adversaries; nor was mercy ever among his attributes. The latest volume of his works, as republished here, contains three treatises, namely, "*Examination of the Principles of Biblical Interpretation of Ernesti, Stuart, Ammon, &c.*," a "*Treatise on Figures of Speech*," and a "*Treatise on the Right and Duty of all Men to read the Scriptures.*" (New-York: E. H. Fletcher, 1855; 12mo., pp. 468.) The collocation of this last with the others is singular: and in this, as in other respects, the book sadly evinces a want of careful editing. The Greek quotations are inaccurately printed; there is no table of contents—no index of subjects or of texts—in short, no aid whatever to the use of the book for any purpose but bare reading through. It is really too bad that valuable books should be got up in this style; and we shall never cease to protest against it. The first treatise is in the highest degree characteristic of the author. He attacks Ernesti; he crushes Ammon; he abuses Stuart; and, in truth, he generally has right on his side, with all the cruelty of his blows. But in this, as in all his controversial writings, Dr. Carson's dogmatism and arrogance detract greatly from the effect of his arguments. He is often right—often wrong; but whether right or wrong, he is equally self-confident.

(8.) "*Art, Scenery, and Philosophy in Europe, being Fragments from the Portfolio of the late* H. B. Wallace." (Philadelphia: H. Hooker, 1855; 12mo., pp. 345.) Our opinion of the intellectual rank of Mr. Wallace was

given in a former number of this journal, (January, 1854, p. 132.) The volume before us, though made up chiefly of fragments of manuscripts left unfinished by the deceased, amply sustains that opinion. Few American writers have shown so much clearness of intellectual vision, with so wide and so varied culture, as this book displays. It consists substantially of art-criticisms of the highest order—resting on principles which are admirably set forth in several preliminary essays on "Art as an Emanation of Religious Affection," "Art Symbolical, not Imitative," on the "Law of the Development of Gothic Architecture," and on the "Principle of Beauty in Works of Art." Then follows a series of graphic and delicate descriptions of all the great cathedrals of continental Europe. A journal of visits to Netley Abbey, to the Roman Forum, and to Vesuvius, with brief notes of a town in Switzerland, is conceived in the same spirit. The remainder of the volume is chiefly made up of remarks upon the great painters: Michael Angelo, Leonardo da Vinci, Bartolommeo, Perugino, and Raffaelle. No one can read these fragments without echoing the language of G. F. H. in this journal, (July, 1854, p. 453:) "I would rather feed upon the broken bread from such a table than upon the stalled oxen of such pompous and imbecile philosophers as Whewell, Morell, and the juvenile eclectics, French, English, or American." There are a few passages in the book, in which Mr. Wallace speaks of the Roman Catholic Church, with the spirit of which we cannot sympathize.

(9.) An ambitious title injures even a good book. Such is the case with "*The Problem solved, or Sin not of God*, by M. P. Squier, D. D." (New-York: M. W. Dodd, 1855; 12mo., pp. 255.) Had the book appeared as a contribution to our investigations into the greatest mystery of humanity, it would have met with a reception better commensurate with its merits than it is now likely to get. The gist of the book lies in the proposition that sin arises from finite agency, "possessing, inherently, the attributes of real cause, originating its own plans." Of course, in order to maintain this proposition, the author has to repudiate the Edwardian metaphysics and the theology grounded upon it. Dr. Squier has an acute and penetrating analysis, and puts forth his views with a good method and in most perspicuous language.

(10.) "*Discourses on Truth, delivered in the Chapel of South Carolina College*, by James H. Thornwell, D. D." (New-York: R. Carter & Brothers, 1855; 12mo., pp. 328.) This is a series of discourses preached in the ordinary routine of Dr. Thornwell's ministrations as chaplain of the South Carolina College. Blessed is the college in which such services are "ordinary." The ethics of Christianity, resting upon a sure religious ground, are here drawn out with admirable clearness of method and exhibited in a style at once pure, perspicuous and forcible, to an extent rare in these days of extravagant writing.

(11.) We must give the praise of good intention, at least, to "*The Dream of Pythagoras, and Other Poems*, by Emma Tatham." (London: Binns & Goodwin: 18mo., pp. 165.) The rhymed portions of the volume are better than the blank verse.

(12.) "*Discoveries in Chinese*, by STEPHEN PEARL ANDREWS." (New-York: C. B. Norton, 1854; 12mo., pp. 136.) This is a very curious and suggestive book. The Chinese language has heretofore been considered (at least by all outside barbarians) as a vast jungle of symbols, bristling with unmeaning knots, thorns and projections of all kinds, apparently of no use except to hinder the progress of any one attempting to penetrate the thicket from the outside. Mr. Andrews thinks he has found a clue to this labyrinth in an analysis of the characters, which strikes us, to say the least, as exceedingly ingenious. The task to be accomplished, as he states it, is to "rediscover the original emblems of which the whole written language was composed, and tracing each through all its combinations with the rest." A proper adjustment of the phonetic and symbolic elements of the language will, it is clear, reduce it to system; if system it has. We confess our inability to judge of the practical value of the book; but, *a priori*, we cannot but put a high estimate upon a theory so striking, and on general philosophical grounds so obviously just. We hope all our missionaries and students of Chinese will have their attention called to this remarkable book.

(13.) "*The Meaning of Words*, by A. B. JOHNSON." (New-York: D. Appleton & Co., 1854; 12mo., pp. 256.) Some years ago Mr. Johnson published a "Treatise on Language," (1836, 8vo., Harpers,) which excited some attention from its acuteness of thought and boldness of assertion. In the present work he takes back or modifies his former theories. His object is to show that all words, in all languages, are either "verbal or unverbal;" that is, they either denote *other* words, or else denote *things;* and that various important consequences flow from this distinction. The work is worthy the attention of all students of philosophy.

(14.) "*A Cyclopædia of Missions*, by the Rev. HARVEY NEWCOMB." (New-York: C. Scribner, 1854; 8vo., pp. 784.) This copious volume contains a large amount of valuable matter. It gives, in alphabetical order, accounts of all the principal missions and mission stations throughout the world, whether Roman Catholic or Protestant. The work aims at catholicity; "giving to every mission the degree of prominence to which it is properly entitled by its age, importance, and success, without respect to the denomination of Christians which supports it." Writers belonging to the various Churches have been employed to prepare the accounts of their several missions. The volume brings down the history and results of missionary operations to the present time. The value of such a work is abundantly obvious: no library can be at all complete without it. We are bound, in duty, however, to say that the vast stores of information contained in the book, are, for purposes of reference, to a great extent, locked up by the *want of an index*. The book has therefore not half its real value and usefulness. There is not even a list of the maps, with references to the pages where they may be found; so that if one wishes to consult a particular map, he must search the volume for it. We are glad to learn that these defects are to be remedied in a new edition.

(15.) THE late Rev. Edward Bickersteth was the type of quite a large class of preachers in the Church of England—devout, industrious, zealous, worthy of all praise as a labourer, but of very small capacity as a writer. Yet he made books with great rapidity; hardly a year was without its volume or volumes; all pious, all praiseworthy in their aim; but all feeble. The last book bearing his name that we have seen (and the last we hope to see) is "*Condensed Notes on Scripture;*" (London: Seeley, 1854, pp. 658;) a huge volume made up of the manuscript sermons and skeletons left behind by Mr. Bickersteth. There are many sound practical sermons in the volume: but better are preached by unnamed men every Sunday, and (wisely) left unprinted.

(16.) "*The Chart of Life, indicating the Dangers and Securities of the Voyage to Immortality*, by the Rev. JAMES PORTER, A. M." (Boston: J. P. Jewett & Co., 1855; 18mo., pp. 259,) is an excellent practical manual for young men. It treats of the dangers of scepticism, of social life, of trade, &c., with clearness and earnestness. The several lines of Christian activity are pointed out, and all excuse for indolence and inactivity taken away. The book is eminently calculated to be useful, and we hope it will have a wide circulation.

(17.) "*The World a Workshop: or, The Physical Relationship of Man to the Earth*, by THOMAS EWBANK." (New-York: D. Appleton & Co.; 12mo., pp. 197.) The object of this book is to show that the earth was "designed and literally fitted up for the cultivation and application of chemical and mechanical science as the basis of human development." In the view of some men the world is a victualling-house; for others it is a show-room or a lounging-place; for others a hospital; and for others, again, a hunting-field: but Mr. Ewbank makes it a *general factory*. It is easy to see into how many channels a proposition like this may run, and how many valuable lines of thought may be made to centre in it. He shows that the earth was made for man, as a worker in given matter, by a consideration, first, of the general features, faces, &c., of the earth; and, secondly, of man, his structure, instincts, and achievements. A third section is devoted to certain erroneous views of man and of matter. Mr. Ewbank is a clear, straightforward writer, who knows what he has to say, and says it. If he makes too much of matter and its uses, it is very certain that others have made too little; and the lesson which he gives is one suited to the times. He has sought to make this book acceptable to Christian and even orthodox minds: but an occasional subdued sneer intimates his *animus* to be, after all, not in harmony with evangelical religion.

(18.) "*The Doctrines and Discipline of the Methodist Episcopal Church, South.*" (Nashville: Stevenson & Owen, 1854; pp. 267.) This volume differs from the Discipline of the Methodist Episcopal Church, both by certain significant omissions and by certain additions. The section on slavery is thrown out entirely; the band rules are expunged, and wisely; the special directions under the head of "Dress," about high "heads, enormous bonnets,

ruffles, and rings," &c., are expunged, and only a general rule against "superfluous ornaments" takes their place. Certain words of the ritual, supposed to imply the doctrine of baptismal regeneration, are also omitted.

(19.) "*Campbellism examined*, by JEREMIAH B. JETER." (New-York: Sheldon, Lamport & Blakeman, 1855; 12mo., pp. 369.) Mr. Jeter has enjoyed peculiar opportunities of observing Campbellism in its rise and progress, and has made good use of them. He shows its narrowness, exclusiveness, and inconsistency in the most thorough way and from the most authentic documents. A little more skill in the arrangement of his matter, and a more concise style, would help the book very much. Mr. Jeter writes from the Baptist stand-point, and uses the peculiar dialect of the Baptists in a way that is sometimes offensive to other Christians.

(20.) SOME years since, in a gentle criticism of GEORGE GILFILLAN, we pronounced him "a literary quack." In the preface to his "*Third Gallery of Portraits*," (New-York: Sheldon, Lamport & Blakeman, 1855; 12mo., pp. 468,) he tells us that "his mind no more than his pen have stood still during the last eight letters." In fact, we think he *has* mended somewhat; he is now only in part a charlatan. Now and then he shows some sign of a critical faculty; but in the main, his sketches, whether of books or men, are mere accumulations of *words* about the subject, rather than dissections or elucidations.

(21.) "*Christianity and Statesmanship, with Kindred Topics*, by WILLIAM HAGUE, D. D." (New-York: E. H. Fletcher; 12mo., pp. 429.) We seldom have the privilege of commending a book of essays on topics of present interest so heartily as we can this volume of Dr. Hague's. In matter it rests upon a profound view of Christian truth and of the human mind to which that truth is addressed: in spirit, it is full of the hopeful element which a belief in the progress of the race inspires, while it indulges no vain fancies of the capacity of humanity for improving itself without divine aid: in style, it is manly, clear, vigorous, and scholarly. In our judgment the ablest of the essays is the last, on "Christianity and Slavery," in which Dr. Hague treats the supposed silence of Christ and the apostles on the subject of slavery better than we have ever seen it treated elsewhere.

(22.) "*A South-side View of Slavery*, by NEHEMIAH ADAMS, D. D." (Boston: T. R. Marvin, 1854; 12mo., pp. 214.) This book is a more marvellous phenomenon than the life of Barnum. A northern Christian minister writes a volume substantially in defence of African slavery: and his line of argument is, in a nutshell, that he spent three months "*at* the south," (to use his own provincial phrase;) and that the slaves, so far as he could see, were generally well-treated, comfortable, sleek and contented. It is true that Dr. Adams disclaims defending slavery, and makes admissions now and then that sap his whole structure at the base. He accomplishes nothing except making a display of his own amiable weakness.

(23.) "*Mornings with Jesus*, by the Rev. WILLIAM JAY," (London: J. F. Shaw; 18mo., pp. 500,) contains a series of brief devotional readings for every day in the year, prepared from notes (left in manuscript) of sermons preached by Mr. Jay during the last twenty-five years. They abound in the warmth of Christian feeling and felicity of Scripture illustration that characterized the similar works put forth during the life-time of their venerable author. It is proper to say, however, that the members of Mr. Jay's family who reside in America have issued a statement declaring that they "knew nothing of the origin of said work, and have remonstrated in vain against its publication. All that the Rev. William Jay prepared for the press has already appeared; consequently they do not recognise in any way the authenticity of the new volume which has been so clandestinely presented to the public."

◆

(24.) "*Shakspeare's Scholar*, by RICHARD GRANT WHITE." (New-York: D. Appleton & Co., 1854; 8vo., pp. 504.) Mr. White is an enthusiastic Shakspearean. He gives in his preface, singularly enough, as one of his credentials as a critic of Shakspeare, the fact that his earliest studies of Shakspeare were made in *editions without notes.* This is something like Sydney Smith's plea for not reading books before reviewing them—"it prejudices one so." But Mr. White has made acquaintance with the critics since arriving at manhood, if not before, and he gives us in this book the results of his reading, and of his own historical and critical studies of the text. Many of his notes are ingenious and acute.

◆

(25.) MESSRS. C. S. FRANCIS & CO. have published a new edition of "*The Poets and Poetry of Europe*, by H. W. LONGFELLOW," (1855, 8vo., pp. 779.) To those who are acquainted with this admirable book, it will be enough for us to say, that it is the only volume entitled to the name of a collection of the poets of all lands. It contains translations from ten different languages—the Anglo-Saxon, Icelandic, Danish, Swedish, German, Dutch, French, Italian, Spanish, and Portuguese. The materials are arranged, first nationally, and then chronologically; the most convenient form, by far, for the use of ordinary readers. The purchaser of this compact book will find it the *best* English version of specimens of the best poets in the above languages; material that would otherwise have to be sought through hundreds of volumes, and which, indeed, may be said, for common readers, to be altogether inaccessible.

◆

(26.) "*The Calvinistic Doctrine of Predestination examined and refuted*, by FRANCIS HODGSON, D. D." (Philadelphia: Higgins & Perkinpine, 1855; 18mo., pp. 131.) This small volume gives the substance of three discourses delivered by Dr. Hodgson in St. George's Church, Philadelphia. In the first, he cites various Calvinistic writers as complaining that their system is misrepresented by Arminians, and gives the outlines of the system itself in the words of Calvinistic authorities; in the second, he examines the theory in the light of Scripture and reason; and in the third, he sets forth the true and Scriptural doctrine of predestination. No man is more competent for this kind of discussion than Dr. Hodgson: his analysis is acute and thorough; his logic well-

jointed throughout; his style clear, nervous, and vigorous. We must confess our surprise, on learning from his first discourse, that the "Presbyterian Board of Publication" sanctions such statements as are therein cited from their issues. It can hardly be possible, we should think, that the intelligent men who conduct that institution have read all the books offered to them by recent writers before putting them to press.

(27.) "*Irish Stories.*" (New-York: Carlton & Phillips, 1855; pp. 285.) This little book is one of the most attractive ever issued from the Sunday-school press. It has all the beauty of a fairy tale, and a better moral than fairy tales can have.

(28.) "*Israel in the World*, by WILLIAM H. JOHNSTONE, M. A." (London: J. F. Shaw, 1854; 18mo., pp. 195.) The object of this book is to exhibit the influence of the Hebrews upon the progress of the human race, and especially upon the four great military monarchies of antiquity. Mr. Johnstone makes the Jews, in fact, a sort of touchstone for all nations: if they treat the Jews well, they prosper; if not, they decay. He applies this test closely, even to the modern European nations: he believes in the future restoration of the Jews to Palestine, and in the personal and corporeal reign of Christ upon the earth. Like every other Adventist (so called) he writes at once earnestly and dogmatically.

(29.) "*The Great Journey*," (New-York: R. Carter & Brothers, 1855; 18mo.,) is another "echo of Pilgrim's Progress," but not so faint a one as most of its predecessors. A much neater edition is published by Carlton & Phillips, (square 12mo.,) in which certain Calvinistic views of the author are "either thrown out" or modified.

(30.) "*Parish and other Pencillings*, by KIRWAN," (New-York: Harper & Brothers, 1854; 12mo., pp. 272,) contains a number of brief articles on miscellaneous topics, some of which have been published before in the newspapers. There are some exquisite sketches of pastoral experience in the volume; but the sharpest and best papers are those which touch on Romanism. One of these, on "Bedini, the Papal Nuncio," is in the best vein of the author of the "Letters to Bishop Hughes."

(31.) A NEW edition of "*The Trials of True Godliness*, by BENJAMIN KEACH," (18mo., pp. 215,) has been published by the American Baptist Publication Society. It is not a very successful allegory, but abounds in practical and pungent reproofs and exhortations to careless sinners.

(32.) "*Detached Thoughts and Apophthegms from the Writings of* ARCHBISHOP WHATELY," (London: Blackader, 1854; 18mo., pp. 187,) is a little book, but full of wisdom. No writer is more rich in comprehensive and suggestive maxims, and in lucid though brief statements of great principles, than Archbishop Whately. It was an excellent thought of the compiler of this little volume to gather some of these pregnant passages together, and offer them in a neat and commodious shape.

THE

METHODIST QUARTERLY REVIEW.

JULY, 1855.

Art. I.—TAYLOR'S WESLEY AND METHODISM.

Wesley and Methodism. By Isaac Taylor. New-York: Harper & Brothers. 1852. 12mo., pp. 328.

With respect to most questions which have divided the opinions of men, contemporary judgments may be safely referred to the calm investigation and the abiding verdict of posterity; but along the line of the world's history there stand out certain prominent events on which the repose of impartial opinion never settles. Excited passion is a whirlwind that extinguishes the taper of reason—a rushing flood that renders turbid the pure stream of the judgment, so that truth cannot be clearly discerned. The intense passions, evoked by the collision of great principles, possess an enduring vitality, not only giving tone and complexion for life to the opinions of those who first roused them into existence, but surviving to influence future partisans and distant generations.

Whether Cæsar was justified in crossing the Rubicon, and Brutus in wielding the fatal dagger in the Roman senate-house, are still open questions; and whether "the man, Charles Stuart," was righteously deposed and brought to the block, or Cromwell was a disinterested patriot or a gross and consummate hypocrite, has not yet been settled by the unanimous voice of posterity. Though the taste of the age in which we live has, in some measure, corrected the bitterness and scurrility which once characterized the partisans of opposing systems, yet of the great religious as well as political controversies of the past it may be affirmed, that the grave softens no animosities and time heals no wounds.

More than a century has elapsed since the Wesleys began their career as evangelists, and yet malignity and misrepresentation are as busy with their names as when Bishop Lavington's book appeared,

and Toplady dipped his pen in what Southey calls the essential acid of Calvinism, to express the intense bitterness of his heart against John Wesley and infant Methodism. It is true, that the enemies of Wesley and his doctrines, in these days, sometimes speak of him in measured terms of eulogy, but they usually qualify their praise by depreciating some particular attribute of his character; thus proving how much easier it is to be apparently generous than to be strictly just.

This undeviating and long-continued course of misrepresentation can no longer be attributed to personal feeling, for those who were Wesley's contemporaries during his career of signal ministerial success, have for half a century slept with him in the grave, and are now represented by their grand-children. Nor can it be ascribed to ignorance, for Wesley's Sermons and Journals have been published broadcast, and the most particular information touching his life and labours has long been within the reach of every hand. As we would not charge the authors of the many works on Wesley and his labours, who have failed rightly to appreciate his character, with wilful misrepresentation, we adopt the construction of charity, and account for their enmity by identifying them with certain theological opinions, which, descending unchanged from one generation to another, are unconsciously associated with feelings of partiality toward those who may have defended them, and of enmity toward those who have earnestly assailed them or exposed their unsoundness.

The book before us is not in spirit an exception to the class to which allusion has been made. Though more insidious in its character, it is yet as replete with bitter and relentless hostility to Wesley and his associates as any of the works which have preceded it. It is due to the author to state, that he designed his book to have special reference to Methodism in England; but as Methodism, in its essentials, is one, throughout the world, we shall take leave to examine it in its larger application to the labours of Wesley, and to their legitimate results in the most comprehensive sense.

The work was apparently suggested by the agitations prevalent some years ago among English Wesleyans; and the author seems to have cherished the insane hope of severing the bond which unites the societies, and of building up the "Establishment" from the fragments of dismembered Wesleyanism. It bears evidence of haste and carelessness in its preparation, though the author assumes the grave character of historian, philosopher, and prophet, as well as of theologian. As a literary performance it scarcely rises to mediocrity; its history is utterly unreliable—its philosophy is affected and obscure—its theology is crude, undigested, and self-contradictory—

and its prophecy consists of the wild imaginings of one whose judgment of the future is born of his wishes.

It may be admitted, that the story, in its leading outlines, is sufficiently accurate; that John and Charles Wesley were born in the early part of the eighteenth century—that they were educated at Oxford, and became presbyters of the Church of England—that they were leaders in an extraordinary religious revival—that, as the work enlarged, the assistance of lay preachers was called in—that, by their joint exertions under the blessing of God, large masses of people were united in societies—that these people were called Methodists—that this revival graciously affected all religious denominations then known in England—that the Wesleys continued to be its leading spirits while they lived—and that they finally died, leaving their cares and responsibilities as a legacy to their sons in the gospel;—but in all the explanations, philosophical discussions, and amplifications of every sort, with which the writer fills in the picture he has given us, we frankly disavow any faith or confidence whatever, unless they happen to be known to us through earlier and better authority than his own, or are corroborated by some authentic testimony. On almost every page, under an ill-disguised affectation of candour, his secret enmity may be discerned, while it is somewhat wonderful how seldom, even by accident, he shows the slightest perception of the high, the good, or the true.

In his initial chapter the writer affirms, without a shadow of evidence, that the Methodism of the present time has ceased to be that proclaimed by Wesley and his coadjutors, having lost certain essential elements, and having been so modified that the relation sustained by the preachers of the present day to the fathers and founders of the communion, appears "to be made up more of what is technical or conventional than of what is substantial, in a purely religious sense."

> "The Methodism of the eighteenth century has, we say, ceased to have any extant representative among us. None are there now who, with an entire congeniality of feeling, can interpret to us its phrases, or can warmly and forcibly speak of it, and plead for it, as a reality with which they are themselves conversant."—P. 17.

On this naked assumption the author takes his stand, and proceeds to take the dimensions of the Methodistic movement, as a thing by-gone, and with the air of a connoisseur examining an antique, he guages the mental and moral power of its leaders, analyzes the substance of the body itself, discusses its form, and foreshadows its future.

To conciliate the unsuspicious reader, and obtain for himself the vantage ground of apparent candour, he thinks proper to put for-

ward the admission, that Methodism must be religiously regarded as a genuine development of the principal elements of Christianity, "while yet it may be open to exceptions, on many grounds, as the product of minds more good and fervent than always well ordered." This qualification gives line and scope for innuendo, disparagement, and misrepresentation, which are so liberally employed as not only to neutralize the effect of the admission, but invariably to place Methodism and its founders in an odious and objectionable light.

With respect to the gratuitous assumption that the Methodism of the eighteenth century has at present no "extant representative," we take leave to record our opinion in direct opposition to that of our author. What was the Methodism of the eighteenth century but the doctrines and worship proclaimed and practised by the Wesleys and their followers? And can any intelligent mind really doubt that these identical doctrines and forms of worship are preached and practised at the present day, not only in England, but in other parts of Europe, as well as in America, Asia, and Africa? The river whose broad surface and profound depths can float the navies of the world, and from whose angry surges when swept by storms, the boldest mariner shrinks back in alarm, may be traced in its backward course to the tiny streamlet issuing from some far-distant hill-side, and from whose ripple no living thing turns aside; yet it is the same stream. The man of far-reaching intellect, and physical maturity, cannot doubt his identity with the child of other years. The Theban Hercules who destroyed the Lernæan hydra, was the "extant representative" of him who strangled the serpents in his cradle. So the broad stream of Methodism, which is to-day fertilizing the world, and making fruitful its waste places, may be traced directly to the diamond fountain which first gushed up amid the arid sands of Oxford.

It is not, however, necessary that we should attempt to establish the negative of this proposition, as the author himself ignores it toward the end of his book, having convinced himself, we may suppose, that the facts developed by more diligent examination fail to support his hasty postulate. In proof of this, we quote the following enunciation of his more mature opinion, namely, "If the Wesleyanism of this present time be not the Methodism of the last century—*a fact concerning which we profess to advance no opinion, as we have no sufficient information,*" &c.—P. 211.

In his chapter on "the Founders of Methodism," speaking of the worthies of that period collectively, the author says:—

> "Let it be confessed that this company does not include one mind of that amplitude and grandeur the contemplation of which, as a natural object—a

> sample of humanity—excites a pleasurable awe, and swells the bosom with a vague ambition, or with a noble emulation. Not one of the founders of Methodism can claim to stand on any such high level; nor was one of them gifted with the philosophic faculty—the abstractive and analytic power. More than one was a shrewd and exact logician, but none a master of the higher reason. Not one was erudite in more than an ordinary degree—not one was an accomplished scholar, ... not one was a great writer, ... As to administrative tact and skill in government, the world has given them (or their chief) more praise than they or he deserved, while baffled in its own perplexed endeavour to solve the problem of Methodism, in ignorance of the main cause of its spread and permanence."—P. 25.

Whether the founders of Methodism were, without exception, men of the loftiest intellect, and "gifted with the philosophic faculty," is an abstract question which at present we are not required to discuss, inasmuch as we are far more deeply interested in their labours, and their practical results. If Methodism be of God, and can vindicate its title to be regarded as a divinely-accompanied agency for the salvation of men, by many infallible proofs, no denial of "scholarship" or "administrative tact and skill in government, or philosophical cast of mind," in Mr. Wesley, can detract anything from its claims to our confidence, respect, and affection. When the Jews were hard pressed by the inferences resulting from the miracle of healing, wrought by the Saviour upon him who had been born blind, instead of venturing to express a doubt of the reality of the miracle itself, they began to discuss the question of Christ's personal holiness. Our author cannot be permitted thus to divert attention from the main question at issue. Still it may not be amiss to place on record an admission or two, which he inadvertently makes in subsequent parts of his book.

One finds himself embarrassed to know what really are the author's opinions, when, after seeing a little, presuming a great deal, and jumping to conclusions, he invalidates his own affirmations by contradictory statements. What weight should be given to the testimony of a witness, who, affirming that Mr. Wesley possessed no great amount of "administrative tact and skill in government," and that neither he nor any one of his associates "was erudite in more than an ordinary degree, and not one an accomplished scholar," should, before his testimony was completed, be compelled to admit that Mr. Wesley "has never been surpassed by any general, statesman, or Churchman, in administrative skill, and that he and his companions were scholars and gentlemen?"—Pp. 41, 79.

A similar course may be pursued to refute another baseless assumption of the author, which seems designed to disparage the work achieved by the Wesleys, by suggesting that the confessedly

deplorable religious condition of England in the early part of the last century has been greatly exaggerated.

> "The rectory at Epworth might be brought forward as an instance in abatement of much that has lately been said of the 'state of religion and the Church' in the early part of the last century; just as Luther's home contradicts the exaggerations in which some Reformation champions have indulged themselves. That rectory was not a solitary instance; it was a *sample*, if not of many, of more than a few, clerical homes; and besides, it furnished indirect evidence concerning another main element of the religious condition of England at that time, and which is too little regarded. The characteristics and the excellences of the antecedent and contemporary nonconformity were there extant—in an occult manner, perhaps, and yet really. Some of the very choicest samples of the firm, consistent English Christian character have been the product of the nonconforming or puritanical soul blended with the *better-ordered and more broadly-based Christian temperament of the Episcopal Church*."—Pp. 26, 27.

This extract is evidently designed to serve the double purpose of undervaluing the great Wesleyan awakening, and of suggesting an oblique eulogy upon the Episcopal Church. In both its aspects, we make no appeal to the unmistakable voice of history, but permit the author to refute his own assumption, which he does in the following emphatic language:—

> "The Church at that time, although it had *animus*, had no soul, and no concentration, moral or spiritual. It had slid far away from the Reformation ground. In reply to its assailants—the Methodists—it dared not make its appeal, as they did, to the Articles and Homilies, nor did it retain more than a very feeble devotional sympathy with the liturgy. Scarcely at all, in a religious sense, or otherwise than from motives of interest, was the aristocracy of that age attached to the Established Church: the mass of the upper classes was utterly indifferent, or was avowedly infidel; . . . . As to the masses of the people, they were nearly lost to the Church, except when a parson or a magistrate could gather them as a mob to carry some purpose of violence. Wesleyanism came in with its itinerant ministry, its local preachers, its classes, its bands, its trusteeships, and its fiscal organization; it came in, not to supplant any existing system of actual discipline, or of Church training, but to establish a culture of some sort, upon the waste, howling wilderness of popular irreligion. When it effected conversions, then it also provided for and carried forward the cure of souls. The cure of souls—a very few exceptive cases allowed for—had been wholly neglected or forgotten on all hands, at the time of the Methodistic revival. . . . . The people of England had lapsed into heathenism, or a state scarcely to be distinguished from it."—Pp. 56, 122, 217.

The Epworth ghost of course reappears in this work—"old Jeffrey" being reinvoked to furnish the author with an occasion to philosophize upon the occult relations of spirit to matter, and to account for what he calls the "instinct of belief" in Mr. Wesley's mind. He states that Mr. Wesley regarded the disturbances which occurred at the Epworth parsonage as "divine interpositions" or "miracles," and expresses the opinion that nothing could occur "so marvellous

that it could not freely pass where Jeffrey had passed before it." The author's discussion of this topic leads him to the conclusion that around us, not cognizable to our senses, there are beings not more intelligent than apes or pigs, some of whom by chances or mischances may in long cycles of time be thrown over their boundary, and get an hour's leave to disport themselves among things palpable. We have not the cruelty to molest him in the exercise of the "philosophic faculty" with which he is evidently "gifted;" but we think it time this ghost were laid. The repetition of a falsehood told by another is bad enough; but language wants terms to stamp with adequate detestation the professed historian who will calumniate the virtuous dead by deliberately coining a falsehood of his own to bolster up a favourite theory or promote partisan purposes.

The statement, that Mr. Wesley believed the unexplained disturbances which occurred at his father's house, to be "divine interpositions" or "miracles," or in any way supernatural, may be pronounced a sheer fabrication, which, though repeatedly asserted, is entirely unsupported by evidence. The affair took place when he was only thirteen years of age, and absent from home at school; and his knowledge of the circumstances was mainly obtained four years afterward from the different members of his father's family. His own account of the affair, published in the Arminian Magazine, begins thus:—

"When I was very young I heard several letters read, wrote to my elder brother by my father, giving an account of strange disturbances which were in his house at Epworth, in Lincolnshire. When I went down thither, in 1720, I carefully inquired into the particulars. I spoke to each of the persons who were then in the house, and took down what each could testify of his or her own knowledge. The sum of which was this:—On December 2d, 1716, while Robert Brown, my father's servant, was sitting with one of the maids, a little before ten at night, in the dining-room which opened into the garden, they both heard one knocking at the door," &c. He continues, and gives a clear and particular narrative of all the circumstances connected with this remarkable affair; but neither in this nor any other of his writings can be found any expressed or implied belief in its supernatural character.

On a point of so much importance, we might reasonably expect to find some evidence adduced in confirmation of the author's naked *ipse dixit;* but the reader will search for this in vain. Though he were one "whose word but yesterday would have stood against the world," we deliberately impeach the veracity of his statement, and demand such confirmation as will satisfy an impartial umpire.

It is somewhat amusing to observe with what pertinacity, and yet with what strange recklessness, the author applies his pruning-knife to the intellectual reputation of Mr. Wesley—lopping off one attribute after another until he leaves him "a good man," it is true, sincere and honest, but destitute of any one preëminent mental trait. Even his reputation as a logician, in the author's opinion, is undeserved. He may have been, he says, "a master of *technical* logic, but he scarcely seems to have been capable of that equipoise of the mind" which is required to deal successfully with the principles of the science. He was sufficiently well fitted to preside in the moderator's chair, during the disputations at Lincoln College, where an acquaintance with the hackneyed sophisms of the schools was alone necessary; but "there was no philosophy abroad in the world—there was no *thinking* that was not atheistical in its tone and tendency; and the whole energy of his moral nature would have drawn him off from any commerce with it, even if the structure of his mind had allowed him to tread at all on that path."

Our object in making this extract is not to enter upon any refutation of the charge,—this were surely a work of supererogation,—but to point out a kind of anachronism which is quite unpardonable in a writer who presumes to arraign before him "such men as those who originated Methodism, and then, with an assumption of philosophic ease and a feeling of irresponsibility, deals with his worthies and sets upon them their price and value. We allude to the statement that, during Wesley's residence at college, "there was no philosophy abroad in the world—there was no *thinking* that was not atheistical in its tone and tendency." The reader, who is familiar with the history of ethical philosophy, will doubtless remember that, at the period referred to, the Christian world was in arms in opposition to the theory of Hobbes; and that Cumberland, Cudworth, and Clarke, all men of profound erudition, with others, had appeared as the champions of Christianity in opposition to the atheistical doctrines of the former; and that the conflict at the very period referred to, was at its height, enlisting the minds and pens of such men as Butler,* Hutcheson, and Berkeley, in England, and Jonathan Edwards, in America. Surely the author could scarcely have been more unfortunate in the selection of a period in European history, of which he might affirm that no philosophy was then abroad, or that there was no thinking that was not atheistical. There were, in truth, giants in philosophy in those days, who, roused from a lazy acquiescence in the earlier ethical hypothesis, by the monstrous con-

---

[*] Of Bishop Butler, Horace Walpole remarks, "he was wafted to the see of Durham on a cloud of metaphysics."

sequences which Hobbes had legitimately deduced from it, stirred up their strength to measure the hitherto unfathomed depths of that science, and they have proved to us, enlightened as we are by what followed, that they were skilful in sounding, and that their lead touched the bottom.*

The foregone determination of the author to "make a case" against Mr. Wesley, leads him to distort the most unimportant actions of his life, and that which in another would have passed unobserved or been considered entirely indifferent, in him is made the theme of grave philosophic discussion, and forced to do service in accounting for what, in the author's judgment, are objectionable features in the Wesleyan doctrines and economy. These discussions would be less censurable did they not abound with so many half-disguised sarcasms and sneering epithets—with so much calculated to ridicule vital piety itself, as well as disparage Wesley and Methodism.

With regard to Mr. Wesley's early religious course, our author divides it into "two stages." "The *first* was that which brought him over from the unbroken hilarity of his natural temper to a fixed seriousness and a determination to frame his course of life under the sovereign control of religious reasons and motives." The "*second* stage" he does not explain, but states that he did not pass through it until he had come under "a spiritual influence of a deeper sort, namely, that of his brother Charles and his praying companions. Charles Wesley's soul had in it more of altitude (profundity and elevation) than John's," &c. Whatever may have been the nature of this "second stage," or "transmutation," as he elsewhere calls it, it must have reached regeneration, for he expressly rejects Wesley's opinion of himself as not a regenerate man at this period. One cannot but admire the modest assurance of the man, who thus on a question of this character, with which Mr. Wesley could alone be acquainted, presumes thus flatly to contradict his recorded testimony. His object is not, however, to elevate the standard of piety, or to show that Mr. Wesley undervalued his own religious attainments, for his motives are resolved into selfishness or a species of religious egotism, which Mr. Taylor considers quite consistent with much self-denial for the good of others. Yet, though he was a regenerate man, he had but an "imperfect apprehension of Christianity!" He fortifies this opinion by a reference to Wesley's "opposition to his father's proposal, that he should take steps for being appointed as his successor at Epworth."

"His earnest piety at this time showed itself in an immovable resolution to think only of his own (supposed) spiritual welfare; and in defending himself

---

* Vide Sir James Mackintosh.

in this position, he stretched sophistry to the utmost—evading by shallow pleas, at once, the import of his ordination vow, a clear call to extensive usefulness, and (if such considerations might be listened to) the duty of a son toward his parents."—P. 37.

Our author is not alone in censuring Mr. Wesley for opposing his father's wishes by refusing to take any measures to secure the next presentation to the living of Epworth. Dr. Southey and some others have criticised his conduct in this matter with much severity; but if his reasons for this decision are calmly considered, it will be admitted by every impartial person, that his motives were conscientious and pure. The main arguments of Mr. Wesley to justify his course were two: *first*, at Oxford he was placed in circumstances more conducive to his own spiritual improvement; and *secondly*, he thought he should be far more useful there. It cannot be denied that the first great duty of the individual is the salvation of his own soul; and if there be a situation or an employment, the duties of which make this difficult or impossible, it is equally clear that it should be avoided or abandoned. It is readily admitted that his religious judgment was as yet immature and perplexed. Having no clear and well-defined view of the doctrine of salvation by faith, he was inclined somewhat, we think, to the notions and practices of the Ascetics, believing in the efficacy of retirement from the world and of self-denial to promote growth in grace and perfect the Christian character. These notions he had learned from Jeremy Taylor's Rules of Holy Living and Dying.

"I know," says he, writing from Oxford on this subject, "if I could stand my ground here and approve myself a faithful minister of our blessed Jesus, by honour and dishonour, through evil report and good report, then there would not be a place under heaven like this for improvement in every good work." The facilities he there enjoyed for retirement and study, and the associations he had formed, made him unwilling, with the views he then entertained, to abandon Oxford and enter upon the charge of a large parish. Admitting the correctness of his premises, who can deny the soundness of the conclusion?

But his leading reason, drawn from his conviction of greater usefulness at Oxford, is evidently well founded, if a jealous regard for the purity and holiness of the Christian ministry is conceded to be a sufficient motive for determining his decision. "The schools of the prophets," says he, "are there; is it not a more extensive benefit to sweeten the fountain than to purify a particular stream?" The Apostle Paul on a memorable occasion would not be persuaded to abandon the path of duty, by the arguments or the tears of his

friends; and his refusal resulted in the establishment of the Christian religion in the capital of the world, while it furnished him an occasion for writing several epistles, which enrich the sacred canon, and have imparted instruction and consolation to unnumbered millions, and will go down to the latest times to preach Christ and turn many to righteousness. Some critic of that period may have called Paul "unfeeling," or thought his reasons for his refusal not "creditable to his judgment;" but though to resist the last sad argument of his friends well nigh broke his heart, we cannot doubt that an overruling Providence directed his decision. "And if we connect Mr. Wesley with that great work, which he was designed afterward to effect, we must shut out the doctrine of providence if we do not see a higher hand than that of man in his determination; a hand which is not the less certainly employed when it works its ends through the secret volitions, aversions, inclinations and even prejudices of the human heart, than when it more sensibly and immediately interposes to hasten or retard our purposes."* That Mr. Wesley was not influenced by motives of "selfishness," or any species of "religious egotism" in his decision, is conclusively proved by his acceptance, a few months later, of an appointment from the Trustees of Georgia to preach the gospel to the settlers and Indians in that new colony. This Macedonian cry from the wilds of America, associated as it was with the prospect of peril, privation, and suffering, was more attractive to the peculiar feelings of the young evangelist than an invitation to an opulent parish in England. The necessity of the case seems to have influenced his decision. There were many applicants for the living of Epworth, but few were willing to endure the hardships and sufferings connected with the life and labours of a missionary in the wilderness. To show the spirit with which he entered upon this mission, we place on record here his reply to one who said to him, "What is this, sir; are *you* one of the knights-errant? How, I pray, got Quixotism into your head? You want nothing; you have a good provision for life, and are in a way of preferment; and must you leave all to fight windmills—to convert savages in America?" He answered feelingly and calmly, "Sir, if the Bible be not true, I am as very a fool and madman as you can conceive; but if it be of God, I am sober-minded. For he has declared, 'There is no man that hath left house, or friends, or brethren, for the kingdom of God's sake, who shall not receive manifold more in the present time, and in the world to come everlasting life.'"

In Mr. Taylor's representation of the intercourse between Mr. Wesley and the Moravian brethren and its consequences, there are

---

* Watson.

some examples of what we are constrained to call flagrant misrepresentation—misrepresentation which, whether made in ignorance or wilfulness, deserves the sharpest and sternest reproof:—

> "His spiritual confidence had received a death wound from the hand of the Moravian brethren." . . . "He had been stripped of that overweening religiousness upon which as its basis his ascetic egotism had hitherto rested." . . . "Wesley's was a mind in the history of which no gradual transition periods—no seasons during which the understanding and the moral sentiments should in equipoised conjunction work their way onward from one position to another—could have place. Each change was either a leap from a precipice, or a being thrown with violence from one standing place to another; and the very next moment after he had regained his feet, or even before he could do so, he turned upon those whose company he had thus left, and assailed them with eager yet never with bitter upbraidings," &c.—Pp. 38–40.

This we pronounce a palpable libel on the character and early religious history of Mr. Wesley. To speak thus of his "spiritual confidence," and "overweening religiousness," in the sense of pharisaism or self-righteousness, is to contradict the whole history of his early religious life. To vindicate this remark, a few extracts from his correspondence with his mother while he was at Oxford, and spoken of by ribald tongues as the "father of the holy club," may be cited. He was often, says one of his biographers,* dull and formal in the use of ordinances, and was on that account thrown "into distress and perplexity," so that he seemed at a loss which way to proceed to obtain the happiness and security he wanted. The deep tone of feeling, and the earnestness of his inquiries in the following extracts, present this state of his mind in a very affecting light. Addressing this guide of his youth, with reference to the advantages derived from participation in the holy sacrament, he says:—

> "That none but worthy receivers should find this effect is not strange to me, when I observe how small effect many means of improvement have upon an unprepared mind. Mr. Morgan and my brother were affected, as they ought, by the observations you made on that glorious subject: but though my understanding approved what was excellent, yet my heart did not feel it. Why was this, but because it was preëngaged by those affections with which wisdom will not dwell? Because the animal mind cannot relish those truths which are spiritually discerned. Yet I have those writings which the good Spirit gave to that end! I have many of those which he hath since assisted his servants to give us; I have retirement to apply these to my own soul daily; I have means both of public and private prayer; and above all, of partaking in that sacrament once a week. What shall I do to make all these blessings effectual—to gain from them that mind which was also in Christ Jesus? To all who give signs of their not being strangers to it, I propose this question—and why not to you rather than any? You say, you have renounced the world. And what have I been doing all this time? What have I done ever since I was born? Why, I have been plunging myself into it more and more. It is enough:

---

* Whitehead.

awake thou that sleepest. Is there not one Lord, one Spirit, one hope of our calling? one way of attaining that hope? Then I am to renounce the world as well as you? That is the very thing I want to do: to draw off my affections from this world, and fix them on a better. But how? What is the surest and the shortest way? Is it not to be humble? Surely this is a large step in the way. But the question recurs, How am I to do this? To own the necessity of it, is not to be humble. In many things you have interceded for me and prevailed. Who knows but in this, too, you may be successful? If you can spare me only that little part of Thursday evening which you formerly bestowed upon me in another manner, I doubt not but it would be as useful now, for correcting my heart, as it was then for forming my judgment.

"When I observe how fast life flies away, and how slow improvement comes, I think one can never be too much afraid of dying before one has learned to live. I mean even in the course of nature. For were I sure that 'the silver cord should not be violently loosed;' that 'the wheel' should not be 'broken at the cistern,' till it was quite worn away by its own motion; yet what a time would this give me for such a work! a moment, to transact the business of eternity! What are forty years in comparison of this? So that, were I sure what never man yet was sure of, how little would it alter the case? How justly still might I cry out,

'Downward I hasten to my destined place;
There none obtain thy aid, none sing thy praise!
Soon shall I lie in death's deep ocean drown'd:
Is mercy there, is sweet forgiveness found?
O save me yet, while on the brink I stand;
Rebuke these storms, and set me safe on land.
O make my longings and thy mercy sure!
Thou art the God of power.'"

In further confirmation of the opinion we have advanced, we add a few extracts from Mr Wesley's Journal, showing his meekness and humility, and the deep conviction of his heart that in religious attainments he was far short of the true evangelical standard. These records were made before his acquaintance with the peculiar views of the Moravians, and some of them before the vessel in which they were fellow passengers had fairly taken her departure from port:—

"Friday, Oct. 31.—We sailed out of the Downs. At eleven at night I was waked by a great noise. I soon found there was no danger. But the bare apprehension of it gave me a lively conviction what manner of men those ought to be who are every moment on the brink of eternity."

"Sunday, Nov. 23.—At night I was waked by the tossing of the ship and roaring of the wind, and plainly showed I was unfit, for I was unwilling to die."

"Saturday, Jan. 17.—Many people were very impatient at the contrary wind. At seven in the evening they were quieted by a storm. It rose higher and higher till nine. About nine the sea broke over us from stem to stern; burst through the windows of the state cabin where three or four of us were, and covered us all over, though a bureau sheltered me from the main shock. About eleven I lay down in the great cabin and in a short time fell asleep, though very uncertain whether I should wake alive, and much ashamed of my unwillingness to die."

"Friday, 23.—In the evening another storm began. In the morning it increased, so that they were forced to let the ship drive. I could not but say to myself, 'How is it that thou hast no faith?'"

The tone, spirit, and matter of these extracts show that Mr. Wesley was a stranger to "spiritual confidence" and "overweening religiousness;" and the readiness and humility with which he sought and received instruction, equally prove his sincere desire to learn "the way of God more perfectly." It is not, therefore, true that he first learned from the Moravians that he was not a true Christian. He had at Oxford a most painful conviction that though he possessed the form, he had but little of the life and power of godliness. He had then a large measure of the "spirit of bondage unto fear," and that after which his perplexed heart panted was the "Spirit of adoption," by which he might cry "Abba, Father." *

But our author complains of the suddenness of the transitions with which Mr. Wesley passed from one stage of religious attainments to another; and, also, of his disposition to assail with eager upbraidings those he had left behind in the race. Mr. Wesley himself affirms that the change referred to was the result of more than ten years of earnest and incessant struggling. If this be deemed a sudden transition, it might be interesting to know what is considered a gradual one, "during which the understanding and the moral sentiments should, in equipoised conjunction, work their way onward from one position to another." And in view of his severe criticism upon Mr. Wesley's sudden change, and his disposition to assail those he had left behind with eager upbraidings, it would be equally interesting to know in what light a man "possessed of the philosophic faculty" would regard the conversion and subsequent career of the Apostle Paul. He, we think, passed through a transition somewhat more sudden than that of Mr. Wesley, and he was at least equally prompt to assail the company he had left with eager upbraidings.

Field preaching, and the earnest and heroic spirit of Wesley and his associates, receive a qualified approbation in the book before us; but the former seems alone to be made accountable for the "bodily agitations and outwardly expressed agonies that were frequently excited in their audiences." Whitefield, it is said, "when these occurred in his presence, stood in doubt as to the source to which they should be attributed. He saw in them no indubitable indications of the hand of God. He looked for such fruits of his preaching as are of a less questionable kind." But as Wesley is contrasted with him in this respect, the inevitable inference is, that *he did see* in them the "indubitable indications of the hand of God," and "looked for them as the most desirable fruits of his preaching." And it is directly averred that it was "his too ready

---

* Vide R. Watson.

acceptance of these supposed proofs of the presence of God, that tended to produce and to aggravate them."

Nothing could be more unmanly or unjust than this gross and unfounded imputation upon the character of the sainted dead. That strange and wonderful mental and physical exhibitions sometimes attended the preaching of the early Methodist evangelists is readily admitted, but that these were in any sense peculiar to Methodism has been repeatedly and peremptorily denied. And that Mr. Wesley "saw in them the hand of God, and looked for them as the most desirable fruits of his preaching," is a transparent invention, the weakness of which is only equalled by its wickedness. Statements like this must neutralize any influence the book might otherwise exert upon persons of the least intelligence, for it will be rightly argued by thoughtful minds, that he who can wilfully and deliberately coin a falsehood so easily exposed by a reference to history is entirely unworthy of respect or confidence. Were it necessary, and did our limits permit, we might easily quote Mr. Wesley's opinions at length on this topic, showing conclusively, that so far from entertaining views similar to those alleged, he habitually discouraged such exhibitions, looking upon them with suspicion and disapprobation. "The head and front of his offending" in this respect consists in having recorded in his Journals accounts of these extraordinary developments; but the most malicious vilifier of his name cannot furnish a *single sentence*, intimating even indirectly that he approved them, much less that "he saw in them indubitable indications of the hand of God, and looked for them as the most desirable fruits of his preaching." It has been truly said, that it is difficult to meet with a divine whose views of religion are more practical and definite than those of Mr. Wesley.

The separation between Wesley and Whitefield is accounted for in a philosophical manner, strikingly characteristic of our author. He thinks it impossible that they could have continued to labour together and address the same congregations, because:—1. Wesley's Arminianism was less liberal than Whitefield's Calvinism! The theology of the former was "cramped," and "walled up as it were to heaven,"—that of the latter open and ample, "placing him on a wider and more elevated ground." 2. "Wesley had caught hold of the paradox of 'perfection,' which, in the form in which he first announced and defined it, prevented any *thoughtful* colleague" from moving on harmoniously by his side. 3. "The difference concerning the 'election of grace,' necessitated in a still more peremptory manner the separation of the two friends"

Yet had they been philosophers or thinking men, the separation, it seems, might have been avoided, for the author thinks

> "Everything for which a Calvinist, not fanatical, would contend, is embraced within the compass of Mr. Wesley's own preaching language!" "And though he rejected the 'election of grace,' on account of its inseparable alliance, as he supposed, with reprobation, yet in so doing he fought a wordy phantom, for no Calvinist ever insisted with more force or point than he did upon the facts of this awful condition."—Pp. 52, 53.

Does the reader think this an impeachment of Mr. Wesley's candor? By no means. The author, "in this as in many other similar instances, easily saves his reputation, as a thoroughly honest disputant, by alleging his entire want of the deep reflective or analytic faculty."

The chapters on lay preaching and lay preachers, with the one containing a laboured comparison between Methodism and Romanism, contain but little worthy of observation. We find indeed, the reiteration in various forms of the unfounded assumptions that "Mr. Wesley himself cherished and fomented, as well among preachers and people, tendencies which it should have been his part to repress. Not seldom it was he rather than they that set reason at defiance, and forgot sobriety in extravagance and wildness," &c.; and that Wesley's creed was not orthodox. The first of these we have already refuted, and to the last we shall presently reply.

We have now reached the chapter in which Mr. Wesley is considered as the founder of an "institute." This, it is affirmed, "*was not*, and *is not* a Church, nor did he himself so designate it." "The Wesleyan societies were constituted for the one purpose of gathering and retaining converts," &c. The writer labours through many dull pages to convince his readers that Wesley intended his "institute" to serve a transient or temporary purpose only. His arguments are drawn from his reluctance to separate from the Establishment, and from the assumed fact that his organization did not provide for the "cure of souls," an essential element of a Church, and a duty which it is deemed by the author impossible to discharge with an itinerant ministry. That the pastoral office could not be efficiently discharged, when the founder of Methodism was engaged in travelling extensively, and was aided by few assistants, may be readily granted; but the force of this objection is very greatly diminished, if it does not entirely disappear, when the preacher remains stationary for two or three years. That the objection, however, is quite imaginary, and never had any real existence after Methodism was organized and became a working system, is admitted by the author himself, who elsewhere gives

to this "institute" high praise for the faithful discharge of the duty, for which, he says, it makes no provision:—

> "The Episcopal Church, in its several offices, assumes the existence and the efficiency of a universally extended religious training; and it is on the ground of this hypothesis that these offices are susceptible of a good and Scriptural interpretation. But as this (supposed) cure of souls—intended to embrace the community, from the first weeks of life to its close—had fallen into desuetude, and had quite ceased to be a fact, Wesleyanism deserves high praise (apart from its merit as a mission to the irreligious) on this ground, and because it supplied so sad a lack of service on the part of the Church."—P. 217.

So, then, it may be logically inferred from the author's own premises, that the Establishment, with all its furniture of a settled and salaried ministry, is less entitled on this ground to the dignified title of Church, than the despised "institute" of Wesley.

The several chapters of this book devoted particularly to Charles Wesley, Whitefield, Fletcher, Coke, and Lady Huntingdon, we pass by as connected only indirectly with the main object of the author.

From the chapter entitled the "Methodistic Company," we transcribe some important admissions, which are a sufficient refutation of the charges of a "cramped," "defective theology,"—"that Methodism, such as Wesley made it, was girt about too tightly,"—"that there is at the bottom of Methodism some misunderstanding of Christianity,"—that, "had Wesley been less argumentative and less categorical, and more meditative, he would have set Methodism upon a broader theological basis,"—with several expressions of a similar character, which are scattered profusely through the work:—

> "Until the contrary can be clearly proved, it may be affirmed that no company of men, of whose labours and doctrines we have any sufficient notice, has gone forth with a creed more distinctly orthodox, or more exempt from admixture of the doctrinal feculence of an earlier time. None have stood forward more free than these were from petty solicitudes concerning matters of observance, to which, whether they were to be upheld or to be denounced, an exaggerated importance was attributed. None have confined themselves more closely to those principal subjects which bear directly upon the relationship of man to God—as immortal, accountable, guilty, and redeemed. If we are tempted to complain of the unvaried complexion of the Methodistic teaching, it is the uniformity which results from a close adherence to the rudiments of the gospel. Uniformity, or sameness of aspect, as it may be the colouring of dulness and of death, so may it spring from simplicity and power; but can it be a question to which of these sources we should attribute that undiversified breadth which is the characteristic of Methodism?" . . . . "Need it be said that these Methodists were men 'of like passions with ourselves?' and such, too, were those who, in the apostolic age, carried the gospel throughout the Roman world and beyond it. Taken in the mass, the one company of men was as wise as the other—not wiser—as holy, not more holy. If it be affirmed that the Christian worthies of some remote time were, as a class of men, of a loftier stature in virtue and piety than these with whom we have

> now to do, let the evidence on which such an assumption could be made to rest be brought forward: this can never be done; and the supposition itself should be rejected as a puerile superstition."—Pp. 128, 129.

If, as the author here affirms, Wesley and his companions, as a class, were as wise and holy as those selected by the Saviour to be the heralds of his gospel to the world, we cannot doubt their competency to place the "institute" they formed upon an economical and theological basis truly Scriptural, or even to establish a Church.

Four chapters of this book are devoted to an elaborate analysis of the substance of Methodism. The prejudices of the sectarian appear for a moment to be laid aside, and the investigation is conducted with a marked degree of skill and ability. Notwithstanding the many imputations, innuendos, and direct aspersions employed in other parts of the book to impeach the soundness of the Methodistic doctrines, the following statement stands prominently at the head of this discussion:—

> "Methodism was not a new theology, or a polemical affirmation of dogmas, contravening or adding to that system of belief which had been embodied two centuries before in the articles and confessions of the several Protestant Churches. . . . And yet, while the theology is entirely what we recognise as the authentic belief of the Protestant Church, the product of the Methodistic ministrations, that is to say, the general or average product, apart from what might be attributed to the oratorical powers of individual preachers, was such as has no parallel even in the most exciting moments of the Reformation; nor has it had any parallel in these later times. We are called upon, therefore, to show what it was which constituted the visible difference—vast as it is."—Pp. 137, 138.

How well our author understood the subject, and how far it had assumed a consistent and systematic form in his mind will appear from the results of his inquiry. We condense his answer to the question, "What was Methodism?"

1. "It was a waking up of a consciousness toward Almighty God, which gave a meaning to expressions of Scriptural doctrine," &c. 2. "It was a consciousness of the relationship of God the Father of spirits to the individual spirit." 3. "A vivid consciousness of the mediatorial scheme; a lively sense of that great truth that God has prepared a full, free, and complete salvation for all men, and which may in this life—this very hour—be entered upon, and enjoyed by every obedient soul." 4. "Evangelical philanthropy." These our author regards as the elements of the power and success of early Methodism. It may seem to some that he travels in a circle ending where he begins, with a simple description of the effects of the Methodistic preaching, while the occult or hidden causes of its power remain undeveloped; but if, with his exhibition of its machinery and various adjustments, we distinctly recognize the hand of God as the motive

power, (as the author really does,) we shall have but little to object to his analysis of the substance of Methodism.

To approve the "form" of Wesleyan Methodism as a scheme of "evangelic aggression," falls in with the author's purpose, and this feature in its organization is treated with commendable fairness and liberality. He thinks it necessary, however, to disclaim any intention of "schooling the extant Wesleyan body," or "advising the conference." Of course! He approves of Methodism as an aggressive agent upon the territories of ungodliness; but he wishes to suggest to the preachers and the great Wesleyan body, that its mission is about accomplished, and that the time has come to gather in the harvest and secure it within the pale of the Establishment. We mean not to intimate that he uses this language, but that all he says plainly suggests it in substance.

This will more clearly appear as we proceed with the author to the examination of Methodism in its various aspects, "as a system of religious discipline and instruction, as toward the people," "as a hierarchy or scheme of spiritual government," and as a "corporation or establishment."

Under the first head he insists that an itinerant must be less qualified than a settled ministry, to instruct the people, and discharge efficiently the duties of the pastoral office, and draws the inference that Wesleyanism is an economy for a time, and that the Christianity it teaches will be always immature and superficial. We are inclined to dispute both his premises and his conclusion.

That an errant evangelist in the strict sense of that word—one really homeless and constantly on the wing—has no such opportunities for prosecuting the study of books as one at rest possesses, with the various and valuable facilities which favourable circumstances may supply, cannot and need not be disputed. This, however, is not the Wesleyan itinerancy of the present, or even of former times. An itinerant in the Wesleyan sense is not an errant ministry. The author has evoked a phantom and beats the air. The Wesleyan preacher occupies the same field of labour from one to three years, generally the latter, and he is not necessarily absent from his home or books more than the settled pastor of a large parish. And these stated removals have not so much tendency to beget an unsettled state of mind, or to disturb studious habits as the regularly recurring vacations in college have to produce similar effects upon students and professors.

Indeed, if we consider how much of each week must necessarily be devoted to preparation for the Sabbath by the settled minister, whatever may be his inclination or opportunities for study—a burden

from which the itinerant may escape as often as he will, by reproducing, amended and improved or otherwise, a sermon already preached in another charge, the conclusion seems easy and natural that the opportunities for study and mental improvement must be in favour of the latter. If the pulpits of those denominations whose occupants may "ruminate under the conditions of a tranquil ministerial fixedness," have in a great measure lost their hold upon the thoughtful and intelligent, as well as upon the masses of the people, and sermons are now rarely remembered beyond the moment when the foot reaches the last step at the church doors; may not this lamentable result be traced to the necessarily crude and superficial character of those semi-weekly or even tri-weekly productions which are "got up" amid the interruptions of manifold parish duties, and are always prepared under the pressure of present necessity? The itinerant, when he enters upon a new field of labour, may go back and review the ground over which he has passed, subject his former productions to a critical reëxamination, and thus be prepared to furnish his hearers with the results of his labour in their most complete and attractive form. Not so the settled minister, from whom is required his "tale of bricks"—his two or three written sermons per week. He can rarely prepare a discourse with that care and research, which his own reputation, or the best interest of his flock demands. He must frequently deny himself the profit and gratification of tracing trains of thought to their sources, or pursuing a subject to its remote consequences. He must ignore all subjects which will not furnish a page for his Sunday's homily, and finished, perhaps at the last hour, he has no time for revision or correction, but must carry it to the pulpit, and pronounce it there, with all its imperfections. An artist with a ready hand will throw off perhaps two or three pictures a week, but they will not establish his fame, or be sought after by posterity. The spectator may perhaps give them a momentary examination, and then without emotion he dismisses them from his mind; but the picture before which he lingers and gazes entranced, and the vision of which returns in after time, is the product of protracted study and patient toil. The itinerant may exemplify this truth in the opportunities he possesses to return again and again to some important theme, until, after having scanned its heights and fathomed its depths, he presents it in glowing language to delighted audiences, who hang with intense interest upon his lips, and eagerly drink in the words of life. But the settled minister, moving in a contracted sphere, possesses no such means for the profound examination of a subject, or for rendering his acquirements so extensively beneficial. Driven onward perpetually

by the remorseless demand of his people for new sermons, he either breaks down under his burden, or grinds on monotonously like a horse in a mill. There are some prominent exceptions—some men of preëminent talent who endure the system, and like the arch appear to grow stronger by the pressure upon them—but that these are the general results of the two systems none can doubt who have had opportunities of comparing the attractive freshness, originality and power of the one class, with the prosy monotony, and superficial tameness of the other.

The argument which proves that the itinerant is really more favourably situated for thorough study than the settled minister, is sufficient to show that there is nothing in the system to prevent him from discharging with equal facility and success the duties of the pastoral office. Indeed, the duty of becoming acquainted with his people would, if additional inducements were necessary, well nigh compel him to circulate freely among his flock. If we add the auxiliary of the class-meeting, which is designed to facilitate the discharge of pastoral duties, and which it is the preacher's duty to attend, we may safely affirm that no people enjoy so efficient and thorough pastoral oversight as the Methodists. And we rejoice to say that no soil has more bountifully repaid the husbandman's toil. Among no people has the gospel been more fruitful. Among no people is there enjoyed a higher average of vital piety; and none are better instructed in both the theory and practice of Scriptural Christianity. The meekness, humility, self-denying zeal, unwavering fidelity, and active benevolence of the followers of Wesley are proverbial; and the "best of all is, God is with us," and "our people die well."

A leading object of the author is to show that Mr. Wesley neither formed nor intended to form a Church, but that he simply regarded his society as a kind of adjunct, or evangelizing supplement to the Established Church.

His arguments are these:—1st. "Mr. Wesley called his 'institute' a 'society,' not a Church." 2d. "The laity are not recognised in his 'institute,' a neglect for which he would have provided had he designed to establish a Church." 3d. "Had he designed to form a Church, it would have been a copy of the Establishment, which he regarded as the model of a Scriptural Church." Our prescribed limits compel us to dispose of these topics in few words. The real state of the case seems to be this:—At the outset of Mr. Wesley's career his single design doubtless was to promote the life and power of godliness within the prescribed sphere of a minister of the Church of England. But when the churches were closed against him, and he began to meet opposition and persecution from the ministers of

that communion, he felt constrained to go forward in his work without regard to Church order, or the approval of Church authorities. Access to the churches having been refused him, he went out into "the highways and hedges," and in the open air proclaimed "the glorious gospel of the blessed God." In process of time, as the work extended and embraced thousands who had never been connected in any sense with the national Church, the question of a separate organization began to be agitated, both among preachers and people. He, from first to last, remained an ordained minister of the Establishment, from which he refused to separate. But from the first gathering of his societies he believed they were clothed with all the attributes of a Church, and that his "helpers" were in every sense ministers of the Church of Christ, and authorized to administer the sacraments, and to perform all the functions pertaining to that office.

The Nineteenth Article of Religion is in the following words:—"The visible Church of Christ is a congregation of faithful men, in the which the pure word of God is preached, and the sacraments be duly ministered according to Christ's ordinance, in all those things that of necessity are requisite to the same." It is perfectly clear that, with the single exception of the administration of the sacraments, the Wesleyan body was a Church according to the views of the English Church herself. But it can very easily be shown that Mr. Wesley believed his "helpers," after being set apart to the sacred office, according to the mode practised in the Methodist body, to be *ordained* to the ministry. "They were not appointed to expound or preach merely, but were solemnly set apart to the pastoral office, as the minutes of the conference show; nor were they regarded by him as laymen, or considered lay preachers, except when in common parlance they were distinguished from the clergy of the Church, in which case he would have called any dissenting minister a layman." In truth, as early as 1746, and indeed before that time, his opinions

> "Were such as show, that though he was a Church-of-England man as to affection, which was strong and sincere as far as its doctrines and its liturgy were concerned, and though he regarded it with deference as a legal institution, yet in respect of its ecclesiastical *polity* he was even then very free in his opinions. At the second conference in 1745 it was asked, 'Is Episcopal, Presbyterian, or Independent Church government, most agreeable to reason?' The answer is as follows:—
>
> "'The plain origin of Church government seems to be this:—Christ sends forth a person to preach the gospel: some of those who hear him, repent and believe in Christ: they then desire him to watch over them, to build them up in faith, and to guide their souls into paths of righteousness. Here, then, is an independent congregation, subject to no pastor but their own; neither liable

to be controlled, in things spiritual, by any other man, or body of men whatsoever. But soon after, some from other parts, who were occasionally present, while he was speaking in the name of the Lord, beseech him to come over and help them also. He complies, yet not till he confers with the wisest and holiest of his congregation; and with their consent appoints one who has gifts and grace to watch over his flock in his absence. If it please God to raise another flock, in the new place, before he leaves them, he does the same thing, appointing one whom God hath fitted for the work to watch over these souls also. In like manner, in every place where it pleases God to gather a little flock by his word, he appoints one in his absence to take the oversight of the rest, to assist them as of the ability which God giveth.

" 'These are deacons, or servants of the Church, and they look upon their first pastor as the common father of all these congregations, and regard him in the same light, and esteem him still as the shepherd of their souls. These congregations are not strictly independent, as they depend upon one pastor, though not upon each other.

" 'As these congregations increase, and the deacons grow in years and grace, they need other subordinate deacons, or helpers, in respect of whom they may be called presbyters, or elders, as their father in the Lord may be called the bishop or overseer of them all.'

" This passage is important, as it shows that from the first he regarded his preachers, when called out and devoted to the work, as, in respect of primitive antiquity and the universal Church, parallel to deacons and presbyters. He also then thought himself a Scriptural bishop. Lord King's researches into antiquity served to confirm these sentiments, and corrected his former notion as to a distinction of orders.

" It should here be stated, that at these early conferences one sitting appears to have been devoted to conversation on matters of discipline, in which the propriety of Mr. Wesley's proceedings in former societies, calling out preachers, and originating a distinct religious community, governed by its own laws, were considered; and this necessarily led to the examination of general questions of Church government and order. This will explain the reason why in the conferences which Mr. Wesley, his brother, two or three clergymen, and a few preachers, held in the years 1744, 1745, 1746, and 1747, such subjects were discussed as are contained in the above extract and in those which follow. On these, as on all others, they set out with the principle of examining everything 'to the foundation.'

" '*Q.* Can he be a spiritual governor of the Church who is not a believer, nor a member of it?

" '*A.* It seems not; though he may be a governor in outward things, by a power derived from the king.

" '*Q.* What are properly the laws of the Church of England?

" '*A.* The rubrics; and to these we submit, as the ordinance of men, for the Lord's sake.

" '*Q.* But is not the will of our governors a law?

" '*A.* No; not of any governor, temporal or spiritual: therefore if any bishop wills that I should not preach the gospel, his will is no law to me.

" '*Q.* But if he produce a law against your preaching?

" '*A.* I am to obey God rather than man.'

" '*Q.* Is mutual consent absolutely necessary between the pastor and his flock?

" '*A.* No question. I cannot guide any soul, unless he consent to be guided by me; neither can any soul force me to guide him, if I consent not.

" '*Q.* Does the ceasing of this consent on either side dissolve this relation?

" '*A.* It must in the very nature of things. If a man no longer consent to

be guided by me, I am no longer his guide; I am free. 'If one will not guide me any longer, I am free to seek one who will.'

"'*Q.* Does a Church in the New Testament always mean a single congregation?

"'*A.* We believe it does; we do not recollect any instance to the contrary.

"'*Q.* What instance or ground is there in the New Testament for a national Church.

"'*A.* We know none at all; we apprehend it to be a merely political institution.

"'*Q.* Are the three orders of bishops, priests and deacons, plainly described in the New Testament?

"'*A.* We think they are, and believe they generally obtained in the Church of the apostolic age.

"'*Q.* But are you assured that God designed the same plan should obtain in all Churches, throughout all ages?

"'*A.* We are not assured of it, because we do not know it is asserted in holy writ.

"'*Q.* If the plan were essential to a Christian Church, what must become of all foreign reformed Churches?

"'*A.* It would follow they are no part of the Church of Christ: a consequence full of shocking absurdity.

"'*Q.* In what age was the divine right of episcopacy first asserted in England?

"'*A.* About the middle of Queen Elizabeth's reign: till then all the bishops and clergy in England continually allowed and joined in the ministrations of those who were not episcopally ordained.

"'*Q.* Must there not be numberless accidental variations in the government of various Churches?

"'*A.* There must, in the nature of things. As God variously dispenses his gifts of nature, providence, and grace, both the offices themselves, and the officers in each, ought to be varied from time to time.

"'*Q.* Why is it that there is no determinate plan of Church government appointed in Scripture?

"'*A.* Without doubt because the wisdom of God had a regard to that necessary variety.

"'*Q.* Was there any thought of uniformity in the government of all Churches, until the time of Constantine?

"'*A.* It is certain there was not.'"[o]

It is well known that Mr. Wesley steadily objected to give his ministers generally in England the liberty to administer the sacraments; but this was a prudential measure merely, and arose not from any doubt in his own mind of the validity of their ordination. His reason is clearly stated in his letter to Dr. Coke, Mr. Asbury, and the brethren in the United States. "I have still refused" [to give liberty to administer the sacraments,] "not only for peace' sake, but because I was determined as little as possible to violate the established order of the national Church to which I belonged." He, however, did appoint ministers for America, and afterward for Scotland, with full authority to baptize and administer the Lord's supper; and although the appointment was conferred by imposition of hands, yet this ceremony did not, in his opinion, increase the validity of

[o] Watson.

their ordination, for when within the territories of England this new privilege ceased. To show that Mr. Wesley did not believe the ceremony of imposition of hands necessary to ordination, as well as his conviction of the possession of full powers on the part of his "helpers," when they were received into "full connexion" by conference, it may be stated that, on one occasion at least, he gave a "helper" leave to baptize and give the Lord's supper under peculiar circumstances, and when in Dublin he allowed two others to assist in the eucharist, to the great offence of the Church people there.

In the Wesleyan Conference this question was effectually set at rest at the very first session after the death of Mr. Wesley. Some of the members, at that time, were disposed, perhaps, to assume some superiority over their brethren, on account of the imposition of Mr. Wesley's hands subsequent to the ordinary appointment by him when received into the body. But the conference regarded such pretensions as absurd, and adopted the views of Mr. Benson, who proved from the New Testament that the imposition of hands in ordination was merely a circumstance, which, though it might increase the impressiveness of the ceremony, added nothing to its validity, and he showed to the satisfaction of the body that they had always possessed a ministry scripturally, and therefore validly ordained.

It appears, therefore, that Mr. Wesley's societies, in effect, possessed all the powers of a Christian Church, according to the "Articles" of the Establishment itself; and that he formed it upon what he believed to be the exact model of the primitive Church. The whole case may be thus stated:—Mr. Wesley loved "The Church" much, but he loved the cause of God more; and when he was admonished by his brother of the inevitable tendency of the societies toward separation, and urged to require from the preachers some specific pledge of adherence to the Church, he refused, observing, "Church or no Church, we must attend to the work of saving souls. I neither set it up nor pull it down, but let you and me build the city of God."

It would not be difficult for one acquainted with the various assaults which the Methodistic economy has survived, to trace the author's views, as developed in this book, to the sources whence they might have been derived. There is in them nothing really new, and yet he writes as if he was exploring a new field and announcing newly discovered truths; never even intimating that all his objections have been very frequently urged before, and as frequently answered and refuted. He is, probably, not very familiar with the literature of Methodism. The sole authorities to which he refers are the Journals of Wesley, and the Minutes of the Conference.

Either, therefore, he has not read what has been written on the topics he discusses, or his candour and magnanimity are not to be commended.

Our purpose thus far has been to vindicate the truth of history, and place on record a refutation of an arrogant but insidious attack upon a system which we both venerate and love. We have, of course, viewed this work from the Methodistic stand-point; and what we have written will doubtless prove less interesting to others than to those who bear the Wesleyan name. But we have yet a grave charge to prefer against the author, in which the whole Christian world is equally interested.

He is apparently so completely fascinated with the idea of "progress," and so infatuated with the charms of a subtle idealistic philosophy, and he makes such high pretensions of dwelling in a calmer and purer region, where "things may be viewed from above," that he has quite lost all respect for plain, old-fashioned orthodoxy. He earnestly insists upon the notion that the received doctrines of Scripture, as well as the established laws of interpretation, are effete and antiquated; and that the time is coming when "fresh minds, applying the unsophisticated energy of their understandings to these problems, will reach ground which they will know to be immovable." "A *doctrine*," he says, "as well as an *agency* is now called for." What is needed is, a "belief derived *anew* from Scripture, by bringing to bear upon this difficult subject a reformed principle of Biblical interpretation."—P. 289. We, he affirms, do not yet know either what is meant by inspiration, or how to interpret the writings which we call inspired; but in the better time coming, men will be raised up to do this work of peculiar difficulty. It will, however, involve "the breaking up of many inveterate superstitions, and the dissipation of many cherished illusions." Then, however, songs of triumph may be sung; for a revolution will be effected in theological science analogous to that effected in physical science by the promulgation of the Baconian philosophy.

These are the favourite ideas of the so-called "modern philosophers." That the Scriptures must be interpreted, and well-established doctrines remodelled, to suit the "progress of the age," is a mischievous and monstrous notion. Its tendency must be to unsettle all existing forms of belief, and to send the Church adrift without compass or chart, on the turbulent sea of infidel philosophy. If such be the vision presented to him, who, by the exercise of the "philosophic faculty" has reached a "higher level," and "looks at things from above," we opine that ordinary mortals will prefer to contemplate them "standing on earth—not rapt above the sky."

We take leave to add a few words on the subject of the recognition of the laity in the system of Mr. Wesley. The author in this part of his work is evidently engaged in a labour of love, and, assuming facts to suit his theory, he appears to wage a successful war with the monster he has conjured up. Few familiar with the Wesleyan system will be deceived by his misrepresentations, or disturbed by his assaults. We are content to leave the controversy as it stands, quite satisfied that Wesleyan Methodism has been successfully vindicated; but we discern some faint tokens that an attempt may be made in this country, and among ourselves, to renew the war on the old issues; and we therefore leave English Wesleyanism for a moment, to speak a word on this question in its application to Wesleyanism in America. There are those among us apparently so charmed with the name of progress, that they are ready to condemn old things merely because they are old, and confounding innovation with reform, would "advance backward" sooner than abide by our present landmarks; to whom what is venerable and embalmed in a thousand cherished associations, presents no claim to affection or respect, but who would rashly tamper with a system whose beautiful adjustments, and efficient and successful workings, have wrought out such noble results for our race.

Whether this be thoughtless folly, or the wicked recklessness of prurient ambition, it merits rebuke and castigation. When, as in the case of the author before us, an enemy does this, it may be borne; but when his groundless objections and stale arguments are repeated and endorsed by those whose position and power are the legitimate fruits of the system they disparage, their course awakens mingled emotions of contempt and indignation.

Nothing can be more unjust than the assumption, that on the question of what is called "lay representation" in our conferences, there is controversy between our preachers and people. Yet it is unblushingly affirmed that it is a question of the rights of the laity in opposition to priestly domination. We believe there is no antagonism whatever between the preachers and people on this subject. The aim of both has been, so to adjust the system that the popular element should have power to promote, not to impede, the ministerial functions. Though an abstract principle may underlie the question, and be involved in the discussion, yet we think all parties interested are disposed to consider it in the light of expediency only. And when a majority, or even a respectable minority of our laymen, shall believe that a lay representation in our conferences will add to the efficiency of our system, their views will be calmly considered, and our polity be made to conform to what may seem best calculated to

accomplish the design for which the Church was organized. But we are disposed to doubt, notwithstanding our author's glowing eulogies, that Wesleyanism, either in England or America, will adopt his favourite "Establishment" as a model, in any modifications which they may hereafter make.

Our author is a comparatively recent accession to the English Church from the ranks of Independency, and some slight extravagance in the expression of his first love may easily be forgiven. But that a man of sense and discrimination, and the advocate of popular representation in the councils of the Church, should condemn Wesleyanism for the priestly despotism of her polity, and laud the Establishment for her liberality, is the very infatuation of sectarianism.

ART. II.—THE PLURALITY OF WORLDS.

1. *The Plurality of Worlds.* With an Introduction by EDWARD HITCHCOCK, D. D., of Amherst College. A new edition, to which is added a Supplementary Dialogue, in which the author's reviewers are reviewed. Boston: Gould & Lincoln.
2. *More Worlds than One, the Creed of the Philosopher and the Hope of the Christian.* By Sir DAVID BREWSTER, K. H., D. C. L. New-York: Robert Carter & Brothers.

IT is one of the inseparable incidents of the progress of knowledge, that old opinions should from time to time be brought up for reexamination, and that beliefs long cherished should be sternly challenged anew as to the grounds on which they rest. The publication, within the past year, of the two works we have named, written by two of the most competent scholars of the age, proves that it is possible to awaken a deep interest in the profoundest philosophical inquiries. To grapple with the great question now brought forward, as these eminent writers have done, to bring into the discussion such vast stores of learning, to task in the handling of the subject such noble powers of reasoning, and to secure for such a controversy so great attention from leading writers, and so much general interest as to call for new editions in both hemispheres, is surely a hopeful sign of the intellectuality of our age, and a proof that the immense advance of material science is not causing a disregard of the more profound departments of knowledge.

It is not the design of this essay to present an analysis of the

arguments on either side, or even a summary statement of the respective theories or positions. It will be enough if we shall be able to awaken so much interest in the subject, as to induce our readers to study the books themselves, as the best exponents of their authors, while we proceed to offer a few independent considerations on the great question, Are the heavenly bodies inhabited?

The question whether the heavenly bodies—the planets, the sun, and the fixed stars—are inhabited like the earth, is now first opened as a subject of scientific inquiry. In all ages almost there have not been wanting vague imaginations, poetical dreams, or superstitious pretensions to supernatural knowledge on this subject. It was not until after the Newtonian philosophy had proved the planets to be material globes of vast extent, subject to the same laws of motion with the earth, that the idea of their being inhabited assumed the more digested and methodical form of a theory. Such theories were put forth, and maintained with arguments, more or less valid, during the latter part of the seventeenth century, based upon the then newly-discovered knowledge concerning the laws of gravity in the planets. But for more than one hundred and fifty years afterward no philosophical writer produced anything like a formal discussion of the question.

The reception gained by these ideas in the philosophic world can hardly be termed assent—certainly it was not conviction, which results from a weighing of arguments, a consideration of objections, a removal of difficulties, terminating in a positive decision of the judgment, determined by the preponderance of reasons in one direction. No traces are found in the annals of philosophy of any such processes of deliberation and conclusion. The theory was passively acquiesced in—have it so, if you will—from the lack of perceived reasons to the contrary, and still more from absolute indifference to its truth or falsehood. Either way, what difference did it make in the determination of any other problem in which mankind were interested? Or, so far as it was deemed a question that could ever become important, its solution was adjourned for a further hearing and for more light—supposing that the researches of the future might furnish additional data for its solution.

If the idea itself is found here and there in the writings of philosophers having a valuable reputation, it is put forth slightly, or obviously as a revived or traditionary supposition, or a dimly-seen and faintly-suggested analogy, and not as a matter of settled and philosophical deduction, challenging belief upon its merits. But while philosophy was treating it as a matter without present interest, it at length obtained a conventional importance on account of its

supposed relations to theology. Some infidel writer either made, or was imagined to have made, an objection against the divine origin of Christianity, on the ground that it was inconsistent with the wisdom of the Creator to expend so much of his care upon one small planet, as to hinge the success of his government upon the results to be obtained here, when there was before him a wilderness or a universe of similar bodies more worthy of his attention. A distinguished and highly-imaginative divine, about forty years ago, set up this supposed argument of infidelity, as a worthy target for his theological artillery, and to his own satisfaction most triumphantly demolished it, by a series of "Astronomical Discourses," the brilliancy of which served to render their leading doctrine widely popular as a literary sentiment, if not as a religious truth. But in all this time the subject has never elicited twenty pages of proper philosophical examination. No systems of philosophy, no transactions of philosophical societies, no magazines of philosophy, no treatises of philosophers, no collection of the posthumous writings of distinguished writers, contain the semblance of a digested and earnest inquiry on this question. As a real question, as a subject of actual discussion and solution, on which philosophers were to adopt convictions, or to form settled opinions, for which they were to be able to give philosophical reasons, it is fair to say that it has never been brought before the world until the present time. The year 1854 has witnessed the publication of two works, one on either side of the question, written by authors of established repute, and filled with elaborate learning and argument. And these works, with the comments of reviews and other periodicals, have awakened so much attention that both have required a reprint to meet the public demand. The question is up for discussion, and the public mind has gained an interest in the debate. Let it be fairly met and fully handled, in a free and open field, with the earnest conviction that there is no real interest at stake but in the knowledge of the truth.

Are the heavenly bodies inhabited?—The question is a simple one, and should not be complicated with other themes. It challenges attention as a question of fact, and should be met and argued on the same principles on which other facts are inquired into and settled. The supposition is to be received and admitted for a fact, just as far it is proved to be true or probable, and no further. If it is proved to be true, it is to be believed, like all other proved truth, and our opinions and beliefs on other related subjects are to be adjusted into conformity. If it is rendered probable, it is

entitled to a regard exactly proportioned to the degree of probability which a fair examination shall establish. If it appears to be wholly unsustained by such evidence as we justly require on such subjects, then it ought to be classed along with other mere dreams of the human imagination, which we never think of bringing into association with the received truths of science and religion. It is unworthy of a philosopher, it is unbecoming in a Christian, to admit mere speculations into the sacred circle of received truths. No man can do it who cherishes a proper estimate for truth as truth. No man can indulge in such error, without deteriorating the capacity of his own mind for the reception of truth and the rejection of error.

It is a misfortune to science that the two distinguished writers who have undertaken this discussion have not brought forward the question in this direct and simple form, as a question of fact. Both of them have chosen to follow in the track of Chalmers, and to present the subject in its supposed relation to the evidences of Christianity. Properly speaking, the question has nothing to do with the evidences of Christianity. If the heavenly bodies should be proved to be the abodes of races of rational beings, it would not destroy a single argument in favour of Christianity, nor weaken a single impression of its importance. As in the cases of astronomy and geology, and mineralogy and chemistry, the evidences of Christianity are never shaken by any progress of scientific discovery. And if the conclusion should finally be, that there is no ground for supposing those bodies to be inhabited, not a single iota of the Christian religion will suffer. If the Bible has any bearings on the question of fact, these are to receive their proper regard. But the main question should be considered on its own merits, and determined by its own evidences. We will try ourselves to keep to the question,—*Are the heavenly bodies inhabited?*

Let it be borne in mind in this inquiry, that the burden of proof is with the affirmative. No man can be required to prove the negative, nor to assent to the affirmative except as it is properly proved to be true. Whoever approaches this inquiry *de novo* cannot but be struck at first with the circumstance that the advocates of the doctrine have not, and do not pretend to adduce a particle of direct evidence in its favour. No man has ever seen, no telescope has ever disclosed the slightest trace of the existence of living beings, or of their works, even in the nearest of those bodies. It is stated that, by the best of the modern great telescopes, observers can examine portions of the moon's surface as small as a square mile, and can discern the differences of color, and the form of its surface. But no

trace has been found of vegetation, or of such changes in the appearance of the surface as human industry is wont to produce upon the earth. The supposition rests for its support wholly upon the argument from analogy. We find the argument stated in the opening paragraph of "More Worlds than One," in a very comprehensive manner:—

> "There is no subject within the whole range of knowledge so universally interesting as that of a plurality of worlds. It commands the sympathies, and appeals to the judgment of men of all nations, of all creeds, and of all times; and no sooner do we comprehend the few simple facts on which it rests, than the mind rushes instinctively to embrace it. Before the great truths of astronomy were demonstrated, before the dimensions and motions of the planets were ascertained, and the fixed stars were placed at inconceivable distances from the system to which we belong, philosophers and poets descried in the celestial spheres the abodes of the blest; but it was not till the form, and size, and motions of the earth were known, and till the condition of the other planets was found to be the same, that analogy compelled us to believe that these planets must be inhabited like our own."

"The few simple facts on which it rests" are those which are here given, to wit, that "the condition of the other planets," as to their "form, and size, and motions," are so like those of the earth, as to establish an analogy sufficient to *compel the belief* that "these planets must be inhabited like our own." This is the case—the whole case—so far as concerns the proof of the doctrine; it rests entirely upon analogy, and upon analogy having this extent. And in order to a just estimate of the question, it is necessary to inquire into the nature of analogical reasoning, and ascertain the value of analogy as a ground for belief.

Analogical reasoning is the method of deducing from the similarity of things in certain respects, the conclusion that they are similar in other respects. A great part of the progress of experimental philosophy has been attained by the aid of analogical reasoning, opening the way and prompting new researches and experiments. By inferring the probability of further uniformity from that which has been already settled, the direction is given to such inquiry as either establishes or disproves the assumed hypothesis. Newton gives to analogy a very important place among the laws of philosophizing. By the sober and patient use of analogical reasoning he was led to discoveries which completed the establishment of some of the most important parts of his system, as springing from the doctrine of gravitation. Indeed, the use of analogical reasoning is indispensable in inductive philosophy. But it requires to be always used with caution, and to be kept strictly within its proper province. The history of philosophy shows innumerable instances of the wildest errors, as well as of the sublimest discoveries

arising from its application. Philosophically, an analogical conclusion can never amount to more than a probability. It may warrant an hypothesis, or serve as the basis of a theory, but can never be the proper ground of belief until its hypothetical assumptions have been sustained by the results of observation. Its force in moral reasonings is in the removal of objections, of which we have an invaluable example in Bishop Butler's Analogy of Natural and Revealed Religion. The force of a mere analogical deduction depends upon the number and the importance of the resemblances from which it is drawn. The mere number of resemblances is of but little moment, because universal variety is one of the first of nature's laws. It is necessary that the resemblances should be found in those particulars which relate to the subject of inquiry.

This is the province of analogical reasoning in philosophy. At the utmost it can raise a probability. In various degrees, it may lead to hypothesis or theory, and so may prompt and guide experiment and observation. A lover of truth will ever seek to employ it guardedly, and to keep it within due bounds. To give up the reins to its control is to soar away into the land of dreams and speculations, as unprofitable as boundless. The great difference between Newton and the philosophers who preceded him lay in the rigour with which he kept analogy and hypothesis subordinate to experiment and observation. In the application of analogical reasoning to the question whether the heavenly bodies are inhabited, we are to direct our attention not merely to the fact that those bodies have many resemblances to our earth, but also to the inquiry whether those resemblances are applicable to the particular conditions which constitute inhabitability. Are the heavenly bodies like the earth in those particulars by which the earth is fitted to be the abode of intelligent beings? It is by a faithful consideration of these points that we may form a reliable judgment of the value of the argument from analogy in this case.

We are told that "before the great truths of astronomy were discovered" this hypothesis was embraced, and "philosophers and poets descried in the celestial spheres the abodes of the blest." They doubtless supposed themselves to be reasoning from analogy of some kind; and it would be curious to analyze the groundwork of those brilliant conceptions. But the philosopher of the present day will see that all those analogies were utterly valueless as grounds of belief, or even of probability. So far as we know, the doctrine of a plurality of worlds, as now advanced, rests wholly upon the new analogy, drawn from the Newtonian astronomy. But the doctrine is the same with that of the ancient theorists; and the argument by

which it is supported is of the same nature as before—analogy. It is a new speculation in support of an old theory. The new analogy is certainly an advance upon the old. It rests upon a resemblance of the planets to the earth, in "form, and size, and motions." It was upon this that Fontenelle relied, in his treatise published in the year 1686, the year before the publication of Newton's *Principia.* "The earth is a planet which turns round its own axis, and also round the sun:" therefore, the moon and other planets are inhabited! Was there not a long step from the premises to the conclusion? Was not such an argument drawn out very thin—even in the condition of scientific knowledge in Newton's day? These were the resemblances which were then known. And it is to be observed that they embraced about all that was then known in regard to most of the planets. And the argument from analogy might have been presented by a bold theorist in this imposing form—that as the planets in nearly all that we know of them, are like the earth, it is reasonable to conclude that they are like it in all other respects.

The sound and cautious philosopher, whose only aim was to learn what is true in the matter, would then have paused to consider how much this argument should be qualified by a reference to that other universal rule, which admits of no exception, that there is variety in all things; and it is, therefore, very supposable that planets might be made like the earth in these particulars, without being fitted for the abode of intelligent beings. Let us wait and see what light may be thrown upon the question by the future progress of scientific research.

It will be instructive to inquire what further light science has thrown upon the resemblances and differences between the earth and the other planets, as related to the question of inhabitability. Almost two hundred years have elapsed, during which astronomical observation has been pushed with great diligence. And now what do we find? One of the most learned philosophers of the age has undertaken to vindicate Fontenelle's theory, without adducing a single new analogy from all the discoveries that have been made in all this time. Is this because the subsequent disclosures have only revealed differences? We find that, in the advance of astronomical research, the planets have been more accurately weighed and measured, their density of structure ascertained, and the light and heat they receive from the sun carefully calculated. The surface of the moon has been more accurately scanned by improved telescopes, and the external appearance of the planets watched to note their changes. And, in addition, it is found that there are thirty small planets, revolving like the earth, and two larger ones, outside of the planet

Jupiter, and therefore still further removed from the genial influences of the central sun. All these come within the scope of the original analogy, and evidently weaken its force by multiplying the original difficulties in the way of a conclusion. For the argument from analogy, in the form which astronomy presents, is of universal application. If it proves anything of the planets, it proves that all are inhabited, just as surely as it proves that any one of them is inhabited. And if the point is surrendered as to any, the analogy is broken as to all. We know that one planet, the earth, is inhabited; and the analogist therefore argues that all are so. But if we find reason to believe of one other that it is uninhabited because uninhabitable, then we establish a counter analogy which balances the first.

We shall not press the argument in regard to the planetoids, recently increased in number to thirty-five, although it fairly puzzles the philosophers; Dr. Lardner gives them up, and Sir David Brewster passes them by. But the moon has the greatest resemblance, in its conditions, to the earth. And the examinations which have been made by modern telescopes, show its surface to be all waste and barren; a vast field of dead volcanoes, covered only with lava and ashes; broken into chasms and precipices; a huge cinder or mass of slag, without any appearance of air or moisture, which are essential to the support of either animal or vegetable life.* Sir John Herschel says that "the climate of the moon must be very extraordinary; the alternations being that of unmitigated and burning sunshine, fiercer than an equatorial noon, continued for a whole fortnight; and the keenest severity of frost, far exceeding that of our polar winters, for an equal time." How dreary the idea of having rational creatures consigned to such a country! The eminent Dr. Lardner, who is vouched for by Sir David Brewster as "a mathematician and a natural philosopher, who has studied more than any preceding writer the analogies between the earth and the other planets," says, in a late publication, that

> "The entire geographical character of the moon, thus ascertained by long-continued and exact telescopic surveys, leads to the conclusion that *no analogy exists* between it and the earth, which could confer any probability on the conjecture that it fulfils the same purposes in the economy of the universe; and we must infer that whatever be its uses in the solar system, or in the general purposes of creation, it *is not inhabited* by organized races, such as those to which the earth is appropriated."—*Museum of Science and Art*, vol. iii, p. 48.

---

* Sir David Brewster, indeed, brings some arguments to show there were volcanoes less than a century ago, and that there is an atmosphere to the moon, but only in the valleys, and not above fifteen hundred feet high.

Thus it appears that in the case of the planet which is nearest to the earth, and most like it in relation to the sun, the more we know of it the less we see of resemblance, until we learn at last that it is absolutely void of many conditions indispensable to life. But the moon is but a secondary planet; perhaps the advance of astronomy has strengthened the analogy of the primary planets with the earth. Mercury, we are told, receives seven times as much light and heat as the earth; and has a solidity equal to gold, while the total mass of the earth is less dense than iron. Venus, as large and heavy as the earth, is only twice as bright and hot; shows no trace of air or water, or of an uneven surface; and may have cooled slowly into a smooth and glassy ball, which would account for its brilliant appearance. Mars is most like the earth in density, in the length of its days, and in having a change of seasons; it is thought by astronomers to have seas of water; but the existence of an atmosphere is less certain; while it has less than half the light and heat of the earth, and gravity at the surface is only half what it is here. Certainly these are important differences, but they are not conclusive with respect to Mars. *If it has* an atmosphere, it is astronomically capable of sustaining inhabitants, notwithstanding these differences.

But the differences are much greater in the case of the superior planets. Dr. Lardner says that "the density of Jupiter very little exceeds that of water; that of Uranus and Neptune is exactly that of water; while Saturn is so light that it would float in water like a globe of pine wood."

> "The seas and oceans of these planets must consist of a liquid far lighter than water. It is computed that a liquid on Jupiter which would be analogous to the terrestrial oceans, would be three times lighter than sulphuric ether, the lightest known liquid; and would be such that cork would scarcely float in it!"—*Museum of Science and Art*, vol. i, p. 35.

The flattened form of Jupiter is said to prove that it is but a fluid mass, of nearly uniform consistency. Its share of sun-light and heat is twenty-five times less than ours from its distance, and must be further diminished by the perpetual clouds that surround it, although in respect of light it is favoured with constant moonshine from its satellites. Its diurnal revolution is made in ten hours, which in so huge a body must cause an amazing swiftness of motion on its surface; and the force of gravity is said to be two and a half times greater than it is on the surface of the earth. These are important differences, when the subject of our inquiry respects the adaptation of the planet to the support of life; for it must be conceded, that if we reason by analogy to prove the existence of life there, and if the laws of attraction and of light are seen to be the same

there as here, we are bound by the same analogy to conclude that the laws of life are the same there as here.

The case of Saturn is still stronger, for its light and heat are only one-ninetieth of those of the earth, while Uranus has only one three-hundred-and-sixtieth, and Neptune but one nine-hundredth. The sun itself, seen from them, would appear only as a star, and life must be impossible—according to any laws of life with which we are acquainted.

Such is the bearing of the discoveries which have been made by astronomy since Fontenelle published his speculations in 1686. They certainly increase the number and importance of the differences, and therefore proportionably weaken the force of the analogical argument from the resemblances as they then appeared. Nor does it answer any rational purpose here to make gratuitous suppositions in regard to the possibility of creating races of creatures who could live in those spheres. There is no argument in mere conjecture. We are now examining analogies to see how far they prove a fact—not framing hypotheses to guide an experiment.

But it is not alone in astronomy that science has made advances in regard to subjects bearing on this inquiry. Geology, chemistry, and physiology, all have made great progress, and shed a flood of light upon the requisites to inhabitability, and the process by which a planet is made inhabitable. The view which we are now about to present is different, we believe, from anything that has appeared in other treatises. It is quite evident that no great amount of help can be gained toward the settlement of this question, by tossing back and forth alleged astronomical facts or conjectures that are so far doubtful or visionary, that two such philosophers as the authors before us are disagreed as to their truth or bearing. The hypothesis that the planets are inhabited is to be proved or rendered probable, if at all, not by imagining what may be, but by showing what is, in reference to their known conditions and indications. And in an argument resting solely on analogy, or the resemblance of the planets to the earth, importance is to be attached chiefly to the resemblances or differences in those points which are found to be essential requisites to inhabitability. We have a certain number of round balls of matter of vast size, all of which have regular rotary motions on their axes, and all regularly revolve around the sun. We wish to know whether they are all inhabitable. And although our means of knowledge in regard to the others are very limited, very fortunately we now know, in full detail, the means and processes by which one of them was taken from its original crude state, and by a series of transmutations at length brought into the condition of inhabitability.

Science has traced the whole process, with great particularity, by investigations and discoveries almost entirely accomplished since the days of Newton and Huygens, and, indeed, chiefly since the days of the elder Herschel. In fact, the question of inhabitability, as resting upon analogy, comes up at this time in a form radically different from its aspect in any former period.

The modern science of geology enables us to contemplate the earth in its primitive condition when it was probably a rotating mass of melted mineral substances, mixed together without any form or order beyond that impressed by gravitation and motion. Such a globe possessed all those grand astronomical conditions of form, and size, and motions, which have been relied on to prove that other planets were inhabitable. But we now know that such a globe was not capable of sustaining inhabitants at all,—not even of containing the very lowest forms of animal life, or of vegetable organization, and hardly even of crystallization. At length the external surface, composed of the lighter substances, cooled into a crust of granite, about twenty thousand feet thick. The abrasion of this by water, aided by heat and many chemical fòrces, produced the pulverized materials which were deposited in layers, and transformed into stratified rocks, of different characters, succeeding each other in a regular order. By examining these successive strata, we find that at one stage the earth became capable of sustaining animal and vegetable life of the lowest possible forms, the most imperfectly formed invertebrata, and the crudest algæ and mosses. Another layer presents us with fishes, and also with a reedy vegetation. Then we have in strata still higher the life of birds and reptiles, and the vegetation of ferns and pines. Above this we find the animal life of mammals and the vegetation of trees with covered fruit. And it is a curious fact, that the most perfect forms, both of animal and vegetable life, found no place on the earth until the process of preparation was nearly completed, and the globe had become inhabitable.*

* The following curious paragraphs are from the pen of Hugh Miller, the great Scotch geologist. In a recent essay, after observing that the *rosaceæ*, or rose order of plants, are the most perfect in their organization, he says:—"The rosaceæ includes among flowers the lovely family of the roses, in all their species and varieties; and among fruits, the apple, the pear, the quince, the medlar, the cherry, the apricot, the strawberry, the raspberry, and many others, from the luscious plum and nectarine, to the rowan and the sloe; and of the recognized representative of the order—the apple—Oken curiously remarks, that 'apples are, without doubt, the most perfect fruits.' 'The apple,' he says, 'consists of all the parts of the blossom—seed, capsule, and fleshy calyx. Its edible substance or flesh is not simply a sweetmeat, but a true aliment, which admits of being eaten after it has been kept fresh for a year—of being dried, exported, or

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

We shall not dwell in detail upon the vast periods of duration employed in accomplishing these several stages. It is idle to set the imagination at work, devising suppositions to the contrary of this. The proofs are ample and complete, that all the general laws by which matter is now governed were in force during the geologic periods. Chemistry, gravitation, attraction, growth and decay, all have left, throughout those periods, the most unmistakable traces of their regular action according to the same laws which govern them now.* And it is equally evident that life, in all its successive

cooked as a kitchen vegetable; in cases of exigency, too, it occurs in such abundance that the whole human race might live upon it,—which cannot be said of any other fruit.' Now, it is surely a curious fact, that these rosaceæ—at once so pleasing as flowers to the human eye, and so gratifying as fruits to the human palate—are among the most modern of plants. They have no place in geology. Agassiz holds that they can be scarce more ancient than man himself. They were, it is not improbable, plants of that garden specially planted for Adam by the Creator to keep and to dress." . . . . "Nearly the same remark applies to Buffon's two classes of animals. The ox, the ass, the horse, and the goat, all preceded man; but they did so only during a comparatively brief period, (brief geologically,) for none of them seem to ascend so far into the past as the times of the Red Crag—a deposit, seventy per cent. of whose shells still continues to exist; and the sheep seems to have been introduced into creation at so nearly the same time as its owner and master, that its bones, like his own, have not been found in a decidedly fossil state. Is there no such evidence of design as a Paley would have delighted to contemplate in arrangements such as these? The man whose first assigned work upon earth was to keep and dress a garden, and of whose two first-born sons the one became an agriculturist and the other a rearer of flocks and herds, was preceded, and but just preceded, by the improvable plants of the garden and field that spring for his benefit, and by the tameable animals —the ox, the horse, the goat, and the sheep. What could he have done as a gardener during the age of the club-mosses and the ferns, or as a farmer or breeder of flocks and herds during the reign of the coniferous trees and the reptiles?"

* The evidence that life—animal and vegetable—existed on the further side of the tertiary geologic periods under the same laws as now, is as conclusive as that it exists under the same laws on the further side of the Atlantic. And these laws cast much light on the rate at which many of the mechanical deposits must have gone on. The lias of Eathie, for instance, consists, for about four hundred feet in vertical extent, of an almost impalpable shale, divided into layers scarce thicker than pasteboard. It might well be predicated, from the merely-mechanical character of the deposit, that its formation could not have been rapid; but how greatly is the argument for the lapse of a vast period of time for its growth strengthened by the fact that each one of these many thousand layers formed a crowded platform of animal life, and that so thickly are they covered with the remains of not only free shells, such as ammonites, but also of sedentary shells, such as ostrea, that the organisms of but two of the more crowded platforms could not find room on a single one. And these shells were the contemporaries of slow-growing pines, that on the average increased in diameter little more than the fifth of an inch yearly." . . . . "In the Mid-Lothian basin there are thirty seams of workable coal intercalated among deposits of various character, whose

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

gradations, took place as early as the earth became fitted for its sustenance, leading to the just conclusion that the earth was inhabited just as soon as it was inhabitable.

But this gives us only a very superficial and inadequate view of the wonderful process to which the earth was subjected before it could be regarded as inhabitable. By the aid of mineralogy and chemistry we learn many more things concerning it, which render it vastly more complicated and wonderful. We find that at a certain high temperature a melted mass of rock under a heavy pressure of water will cool into a semi-crystalline form like granite. Then an incumbent ocean, and an atmosphere perhaps heavily charged with gaseous matters, would, while heated, abrade and dissolve the chief materials of the crust, and deposit the same in layers, which might be subjected to a degree of heat sufficient to give the actual form to the primitive stratified rocks. The heated water would dissolve the silicious matters. After that, the cooled waters would dissolve the lime that forms the primitive limestone rocks. Then other changes occur of mineralogical character, or of chemical composition, imply-

united thickness amounts to nearly three thousand feet; and undermost of these seams the original soil may still be detected on which the plants that formed their coal flourished and decayed. Whole beds of the mountain limestone are composed almost exclusively of marine shells and the stems of lily encrinites. In the old red sandstone there are three different formations abounding in fishes —and yet, so far as is yet known, there is not a single species of fish common to any two of them. And who shall tell us that the life-term of a *creation* is a brief period? In the upper silurian system we have examined a deposit more than fifty feet thick, every fragment of which had once been united to animal life, crustaceous, molluscan, or radiated. And how wonderfully, too, the further geologists explore, and the more carefully they examine, are their formations found to expand! Phillips estimated the thickness of the coal measures at ten thousand feet. Sir Charles Lyell, in one of his recent visits to America, found that the coal measures of Nova Scotia had a thickness of more than *fourteen* thousand six hundred feet. Phillips estimated all the deposits beneath the old red sandstone at twenty thousand feet. The geologists of the government survey find that the silurians alone amount to about *thirty* thousand feet; and under these, in Scotland at least, lie the clay slates, the mica schists, and the enormous deposits of the gneisses. On the continent the remains of whole creations have been found intercalated between what had been deemed contiguous systems. An entire system—the permian—has been detected between the coal measures and the trias; and that shell deposit that extends between the Gironde and the Pyrenees, once regarded as of the same age with the coraline crag, has yielded seven hundred species of shells—nearly twice the number of all the species found on the coasts of Britain—that belong neither to the crag nor to the older eocene. It is yet another creation that has appeared, for which fitting space must be found in the record. The more thoroughly the field-geologist examines, the larger become his demands on the eternity of the past, for periods which it is certainly very competent to supply."—*Hugh Miller.*

ing the action of water, of the atmosphere, and of intense heat. Chemical elements are absorbed from the water, others are abstracted from the air, new systems of rocks are precipitated and consolidated, and again broken and abraded, comminuted and mingled together, until at length a surface and a temperature are produced which admit of the lowest forms of vegetable and animal life. These collect and combine new chemical elements, which by the decay of the animal and vegetable species, become available for new forms of rocks. This process is repeated many times; the results showing that at each successive stage, either such new and useful materials have been gathered, or such deleterious elements have been abstracted from earth, air, and water, as to admit of more and more perfect development of animal and vegetable natures. At one stage we find the marks to indicate the prevalence of vegetation almost exclusively, and this of so huge a growth as to furnish the material for all the coal formations in the world. How vast the quantity of carbon that existed in other forms, prior to its consolidation into the beds of coal! After this we find traces of animal life of huge dimensions; lizards eighty feet long, and birds thirty feet high; but all still belonging to the less perfect and complicated species, showing that the earth was not finished, and that the air and water were still overcharged with grosser elements. The vast quantities of lime in various forms, the many other mineral substances diffused through the upper secondary, and the tertiary rocks, may illustrate the many chemical processes for which the earth is indebted to animal and vegetable life, before it was reduced to a habitable state. It is to be borne in mind that every rock, every mineral, every pebble and grain of sand has a chemical history, as well as a mineralogical history; and that every one of its elements has been eliminated in some way out of the air or water, or out of the materials of that molten mass which forms the internal substance of the globe. Also, that each separate species, both of animals and vegetables, has some peculiarity in its chemical composition or product, and, therefore, serves some distinct and separate purpose in the wonderful work.

It is to processes like these that we are indebted for all the mineral and metallic riches of the earth—for that countless variety of substances which aid in manufactures, fill the shelves of the apothecary, and which enable us to furnish our tables, build our houses, and navigate our ships. And all these are found to be abundant and widely diffused, in proportion to their indispensableness for human welfare. We find them so posited and arranged as to afford a great motive to industry and to study, a spring to invention, objects for commerce, and a bond of unity for nations. Deprived of them all, the

world would be uninhabitable—deprived of any one of them, it would be less fitted than it is to be the abode of intelligent beings.

It would extend this paper too much to illustrate all these points in detail. But it would be easy to show that the perfection of these innumerable processes required the existence of many conditional circumstances. It required a globe of a certain size to give the right degree of pressure to the incumbent fluid while the primitive crust was cooling. It required a molten mass within, so great as to keep alive the inward fire through all the duration allotted to the globe itself. It required a certain distance from the sun, so as to secure an equable and sufficient surface heat, and yet not too great for the highest development of life.

It required, also, a proper length of the day and of the year; the influences of the moon to produce tides; water that could be made pure by mere evaporation; an atmosphere of proper density to support the water in clouds; electricity sufficient to break the clouds and precipitate the water again to the earth, and yet not too much to permit life. It required that there should be such atmospheric changes as would disintegrate rocks, favour vegetation, and keep the air itself in a state of self-purification. Failing any one of these requisites, it is impossible to prove that the earth could ever have been reduced to a state of habitability by any process of natural causes. And it would be easy to demonstrate that, without the presence of the greater part of the actual conditions of the earth, it would not have been inhabitable at all. For it is ever to be kept in view that the same rules of analogical reasoning which have raised the main question before us, establish for us the meaning of inhabitability, and limit our speculations to the laws of life of the material universe as we find them upon the earth.

There is a consideration to be brought in here, which is derived from the science of agriculture. Pulverized rock is not soil. It requires the process of animal and vegetable life to produce soil; and it is found that, in a general way, soil is productive in proportion to the number and variety of animal and vegetable processes through which it has passed. Everywhere mosses and minute animals are at work, then trees and animals and birds, absorbing chemical substances from the air, and depositing them in the earth; or feeding upon the solid ingredients of earth or rock, and giving them back in new chemical combinations. It is only through the infinite number and variety of these agencies that all the processes of nature's chemistry are carried on, so as to make the earth properly inhabitable. And it was not until the completion of this lengthened chain of changes, that the earth was found capable of sustaining such

animal organizations as were suitable to be endowed with rational capacities and moral obligations. It were unworthy of the dignity of reason, to be bestowed upon saurian monsters or more primeval oysters and star-fish. It were equally unsuitable that the reasoning creature whose existence crowns and finishes creation's work should be introduced into a world which was not already occupied with the most perfect animal and vegetable natures, both for delight and use. And how impracticable were the labour of our life, if we had nothing to commence upon but cold rock-dust, and nothing to subsist upon but the primeval mosses and animated mites of the paleozoic period; with no wheat, no apples, no roses, and no perfected soil on which they could grow; with no ox, or sheep, or horse, and no vegetation on which they could subsist. It is a curious fact, worthy of being noted here, that gold, the perfect metal, appears to have been injected into the rocks from which it has been abraded into the loose earth, at a period later than the formation of the tertiary rocks, as no traces of it are found in them, and it enters into no chemical combination, being made for man alone.

With the knowledge that we now have of the various particulars which go to make a planet habitable, and of the immensely complicated and prolonged process by which a planet is brought into the required condition for the occupancy of inhabitants, we must again examine the force of the analogical reasoning which would prove that the other planets are inhabited. In how many of these respects do they resemble the earth, and in how many particulars do they differ; and what is the relative value or importance of the things in which they agree, and the things in which they differ?

We find the moon so small that it is cooled to a slag; that its inward fires produced a succession of terrific volcanoes, until its water and air were exhausted, and its fires went out. We find Venus and Mercury, the one receiving twice and the other seven times as much light and heat from the sun as this earth, and of much greater density; and Venus is apparently a perfectly smooth globe that has never possessed such an excess of internal heat as to agitate its outward surface. It would be difficult to believe that it has ever undergone so great a change on the surface as is involved in the first formation of stratified rock. Mars is more like the earth in its motions and periods, and is believed by many to be supplied both with water and air, though many have doubts as to the latter. But its force of gravity is so small, from its diminished size, and its heat from the sun is so greatly reduced by distance, that a large part of the complicated process we have described is impossible. Then Jupiter, with its huge bulk of the consistence of water, and

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

Saturn much lighter, and Uranus and Neptune so far from the sun that it could only be seen from them as a star—the process of preparation for the support of inhabitants could never begin in either of those planets. There is not one particular among all the discoveries of modern science that tends to strengthen the analogy between the earth and the other planets, beyond the force it had when the discovery was first made that they were all alike in form and motion. But on the contrary, the progress of knowledge has absolutely disproved the only theorem which could ever have been formed on the subject. We cannot say now that a revolving sphere is of course to be presumed inhabited, because we know that the earth was a revolving sphere for countless ages when it was not inhabited. And we know also that it required a complicated process of preparation before it was inhabitable, and that a large part of these preparatory processes are impossible with respect to most of the other planets.*

In the pursuit after truth, the argument from analogy is bound to submit to a more rigid scrutiny, when it stands alone as the sole proof on which our belief is claimed, than in those cases where it comes in aid of a belief founded on other and more positive evidence; or where, as in Butler's Analogy, it is employed mainly to remove objections and solve difficulties in regard to our belief. We have not a scintilla of evidence, from science or revelation, to prove that the planets are inhabited, except the argument from analogy. There is not a fact in nature or in religion, that has obtained the general belief of mankind on analogies so slight as we have found, and in the face of counter-analogies so numerous and overwhelming.

In our examination of this argument from analogy, it is irrelevant to take into consideration the various suppositions of what *may be.* When a matter is proved to be true, we may indulge to an extent in suppositions of what *may be* in consequence. But our first inquiry respects *what is,* and not what *may be.* And until we find substantial proof, or highly-probable analogy, to warrant a belief that the planets are inhabited, it is unphilosophical to indulge in groundless conjectures as to what sort of beings those inhabitants may be. All the analogy we have in the case compels us to suppose that if the planets are inhabited the bodily organs of the inhabitants must so far resemble ours as to be the inlets both of pleasure and pain, of

---

* The meteoric stones are unquestionably planetary matter. They are found to contain no new chemical element, and no new mineralogical type; and they are subject to all the laws of matter like the materials of our earth. But of sixty chemical elements, they present only eighteen, thus lacking thirty per cent. of the number of primary substances which go to fit the earth for the abode of man.

health and disease, of the means of prolonging life and the causes of producing death, of temptations to evil and of retributive consequences following the wrong. The law of compensations must prevail there as here. If organs are constructed differently from ours, they will not answer all the purposes of ours. If senses are more acute, they must cause temptation to be more active, and suffering more severe, and retribution more terrible.

It is not to the purpose to suggest that the planets may be undergoing a preparatory process to be inhabited hereafter. The question is of the grounds for believing that they are now inhabited. We will not recapitulate the reasons which exist for believing that they are not capable of undergoing those changes, under the laws of nature through which the earth has been fitted to be inhabited. They do not possess that exact adjustment of internal and solar heat, of gravity and motion, of light and electricity, that due proportion of solid and fluid and aërial matter, that exact adjustment of oxygen to the quantity of carbon and of the metallic bases, which are requisite to the success of this preparatory course. Nor is it to the purpose to suggest that they may be looked to as some of the "many mansions" that are to be the abode of glorified human beings after the resurrection. For we know that a still more absolute metamorphosis is to take place before that event;—the heavens shall pass away with a great noise, the elements shall melt with fervent heat, and the earth also and the works that are therein shall be burned up. And the inhabitants will then have bodies which are no longer subject to decay, organs which are never to become the inlets of temptation or pain, and powers which know no fatigue or dissolution. And they will require abodes which will have no need of sun or moon, and into which there shall nothing enter that defileth, or worketh abomination, or maketh a lie. These laws of gravity and friction, of heat and light, of hydrostatics and pneumatics, of crystallization and chemical affinity, of animal and vegetable life, of succession and decay, are but feeble forces toward a transformation so complete, and so manifestly demanding the interposition of the same creative Omnipotence which formed the present world under its present laws.

As a question of science, then, the doctrine of a plurality of worlds is placed too low on the scale of probability to occupy the serious attention of the philosopher. The only interest it possesses is inspired by a materialized imagination, like that which peoples the woods with sprites, and the fields with fairies. Hard as it is to prove a negative, especially in a case where there is so little knowledge on a subject as to furnish nothing in proof of the affirmative, it must be admitted that we have here as much evidence to prove the

negative, as the nature of the case admits. And we may safely offer the prediction that, hereafter, no philosopher, in the true pursuit of scientific truth, will ever undertake a series of observations, or go through a course of calculations, with the object of proving that the planets are inhabited.

We have not yet considered the *a priori* argument, which seems to have impressed many with its force, drawn from what is supposed to be due to the character of the Creator. Dr. Chalmers, in his Astronomical Discourses, states it thus:—"What reason have we to think that those mightier globes, which roll in other parts of creation, and which we have discovered to be worlds in magnitude, are not also *worlds in use and dignity?* Why should we think that the great Architect of nature, supreme in wisdom as he is in power, would call those stately mansions into existence, *and leave them unoccupied?*" The celebrated Dr. Bentley, in his sermon on the "Origin and Frame of the World," asks: "Would it not raise in us a *higher apprehension of the infinite majesty and boundless beneficence of God*, to suppose that those remote and vast bodies were formed not merely upon our account, to be guessed at through an optic glass, but for different ends *and nobler purposes?*" But Sir David Brewster has more fully developed this form of the argument in his late publication, "More Worlds than One." We shall present it most fairly and fully by the quotation of several separate paragraphs:—

> "If the Almighty has occupied a million of years in preparing the most of the earth as a suitable residence for man, by the slow operation of secondary causes, and has deposited the remains of vegetable and animal life in each series of its formation, in order to enable man to read the history of his omnipotence and wisdom, is that any reason why the earth, the residence of man, should, among countless and more glorious worlds than his own, be the only one that is inhabited? Reason and common sense dictate a very different opinion."—P. 214, New-York edition.
>
> "Considering the solar system as stationary in space, and unconnected with any other system, the argument for the existence of inhabitants on its planets has a certain fixed value, compounded of the argument from analogy, and the degree of *absurdity which attaches to the idea* of the planets being lumps of moving matter, shone upon and shining *in vain.* But when we have proved that the solar system is revolving round some distant centre, in an orbit of such inconceivable dimensions, that millions of years might be required to perform one single round; when we consider that this distant centre must be a sun, with attending planets like our own, revolving in like manner round our sun, or round the common centre of gravity, the mind *rejects almost with indignation the ignoble sentiment*, that man is the only being that performs this immeasurable journey; that Jupiter and Saturn, and Uranus and Neptune, with their bright array of regal train-bearers, are but colossal blocks of lifeless clay, encumbering the earth as a drag, and *mocking the creative* majesty of heaven.
>
> "It is hardly necessary to illustrate these views by more familiar similitudes. The Architect of a solar system, stationary in space, and with but one

of its smallest planets inhabited, may in some degree be likened to a sovereign who, in sending a military colony to cultivate and defend an island in the Pacific, engaged twenty-five soldiers, *one* of whom was a light-infantry man, who did all the honours and duties of the island, while the other *twenty-four* were tall and powerful grenadiers, who enjoyed themselves day and night upon merry-go-rounds, heated by genial fires, and lighted by brilliant chandeliers of gas, but performing *no useful work, and doing no honour to their king.* The Creator of the same solar system launched into an orbit of immeasurable extent, and wheeling through ether with the velocity of fifty-seven miles in a second, may have some resemblance to a mighty autocrat, who should establish a railway round the coasts of Europe and Africa, and place upon it an enormous train of first-class carriages, impelled year after year by tremendous steam power, while there was but a *philosopher and a culprit in an humble van*, attended by hundreds of unoccupied carriages and empty trucks."—Pp. 128–130.

"Those *ungenial minds that can be brought to believe* that the earth is the only inhabited body in the universe, will have no difficulty in conceiving that *it, also, might have been* without inhabitants. Nay, if such minds are imbued with geological truth, they must admit that for millions of years *the earth was without* inhabitants; and hence we are led to the extraordinary result that for millions of years there was not an intelligent creature in the vast dominions of the universal King; and that before the formation of the protozoic strata, there was neither a planet nor an animal throughout the infinity of space! During this long period of universal death, when nature herself was asleep, the sun with his magnificent attendants, the planets with their faithful satellites, the stars in the binary systems, the solar system itself, were performing their daily, their annual, their secular movements, unseen, unheeded, and *fulfilling no purpose that human reason can conceive*—lamps lighting nothing—fires heating nothing—waters quenching nothing—clouds screening nothing—breezes fanning nothing—and everything around, mountain and valley, hill and dale, earth and ocean, *meaning nothing.*

"The stars
Did wander darkling in the eternal space."

"To our apprehension, such a condition of the earth, of the solar system, of the sidereal universe, would be the same as that of our own globe, if all its vessels of war and of commerce were traversing its seas with empty cabins and freightless holds; as if all the railways on its surface were in full activity, without passengers and goods; and all our machinery beating the air and gnashing their teeth without work performed. A house without tenants, a city without citizens, presents to our minds *the same idea as a planet without life*, and a universe without inhabitants. *Why the house was built*, why the city was founded, *why the planet was made*, and why the universe was created, it would be *difficult even to conjecture.* Equally great would be the difficulty were the planets shapeless lumps of matter poised in ether, and motionless as the grave; but when we consider them as chiselled spheres teeming with inorganic beauty, and in full mechanical activity; performing their appointed motions with such universal precision that their days and their years never err a second of time in hundreds of centuries, the *difficulty of believing them* without life is, if possible, immeasurably increased. To conceive any one material globe, whether a gigantic clod slumbering in space, or a noble planet equipped like our own, and duly performing its appointed task, *to have no living* occupants, or *not in a state of preparation to receive* them, seems to us one of those notions which *could be harboured only in an ill-educated and ill-regulated mind*,—a mind without faith and without hope. But *to conceive* a whole universe of moving and revolving worlds in such a category, indicates, in our apprehension, *a mind dead to feeling and shorn of reason!*"—Pp. 186–189.

> "Is it possible to believe that, with the exception of our little planet, all the other planets of the system, all the hundreds of comets, all the systems of the universe, are to *our reason made in vain?*"—P. 191.
>
> "It is just possible that these walls may never have been a protection to inhabitants, nor these churches thronged, nor these houses occupied; but if this were the case, the sovereign who founded the city, who encircled it with a wall, who erected the churches, and who built the houses, *must have been a fool or a madman.*"—P. 197.

Most certainly, no one will think of charging this learned Scotchman with intentional irreverence toward his Maker. But these paragraphs strike us as the boldest attempt to scan the undisclosed counsels and purposes of the Most High that we have ever met with, unless in the ravings of professed blasphemers. The old question rises before us, "Shall the thing formed say of him that formed it, Why hast thou made me thus?" And we hear a voice saying, "As the heavens are above the earth, so are my ways above your ways, and my thoughts above your thoughts." And we exclaim with the sacred poet, "Who by searching can find out God, and who can understand the Almighty to perfection? It is high as heaven, what canst thou know? deeper than hell, what canst thou do?" And we ask ourselves, Is reason competent to determine questions on which nature furnishes so very insufficient data, and concerning which revelation is silent? And is it necessary that we should attempt to solve problems so high and far-reaching, when neither the facts nor their knowledge can affect our happiness or our duty; and neither science nor religion has furnished the first particle of proof on which to rest our belief?

The argument would seem to assume that the planets themselves are degraded and injured, unless they are permitted to enjoy the presence and serve the purposes of inhabitants, and would, therefore, have a right to complain. It assumes that man is competent to judge and say, that planets left destitute of inhabitants are made in vain. It assumes it as an axiom, that planets are for inhabitants, just as houses are for people, and just as ships are for passengers; when all that we know of the matter is that *one* planet is inhabited. It dares to say to the Creator, that *if he has* created these bodies, and left them without inhabitants, he has committed a palpable absurdity, has been governed by "notions which could be harboured only in an ill-educated and ill-regulated mind;" and has pursued a policy, which, if pursued by a human sovereign, would prove that he "must have been a fool or a madman." Yet no man can deny that it is possible to suppose such improvements hereafter in our telescopes, or other means of acquiring a knowledge of the heavenly bodies, as shall afford us actual demonstration of the facts, that the planets are not inhabited, and are not capable from their

structure of being fitted for the support of inhabitants. And then how shocking will these vain-glorious assumptions appear!

The truth is, we have no competency whatever to determine, *a priori*, what is wise or fitting for the Creator to do in the creation of the world. We know but little of his works, and vastly less of his reasons, and still infinitely less of his comprehensive designs. Where we find that a thing is made fit for a certain purpose, we infer that such purpose was at least a part of the reason why it was created thus. But we are not competent to infer that, because one of a class of things possesses certain qualities or capabilities, therefore all of that class possesses the same in all respects. We know that universal diversity is the most wide-spread law of creation, for in fact no two things are made precisely alike. We know that things nearly related are often widely opposite in effect, as the same species of plants includes the potato and the deadly night-shade. We know that God has reserved to himself the unchallenged prerogative of acting on the dictates of his own wisdom, and, of the same lump of clay, of making "one vessel unto honour, and another to dishonour;" and that every created thing is right and honourable when it answers the end for which he made it. We know that the planets and other heavenly bodies subserve many objects for the benefit of mankind, and it is not competent for us to decide that these objects alone are not ample reasons to justify their creation. We know that the production of these systems, or of innumerable others supposable, was a work of infinite ease to Him who "spake, and it was done—commanded, and it stood fast." We know that the planets are useful to the earth as the abode of man, by constituting a part of the solar system, and contributing by their gravity and motion to the regularity of the whole. In many other ways they are serviceable, as in determining latitude and longitude, and other astronomical problems. Their light and beauty contribute largely to the pleasantness of man's earthly abode. Perhaps no science has contributed so much to the enlargement and cultivation of the intellect as astronomy. The moral and religious influence of the heavenly bodies, in leading the thoughts of men up to the great Creator, is incalculably great, and apparently essential to the preservation of piety on earth. We know the value which God has put upon the earth as the abode of man, by the fact that he has given his only-begotten Son to die upon the earth for the redemption of sinners among men. And having for this end actually made the only sacrifice which God can make, it is a small thing to believe that he might create any number of these planets and stars with no higher end in view than to aid in rendering the earth a fit theatre for the work of redemption. In

view of all this, it is evident that our *a priori* conclusions as to what "must be" the use or end of creating planets are not of the weight of a straw. Nay, more, it is criminal presumption in us to form such conclusions at all, with any degree of confidence that is likely to affect our estimate of the character and government of God; for secret things belong to him alone. But on the other hand, it seems plain to our view, that the whole affluence of the material universe, if appropriated to man and his redemption, is strictly in keeping with all that he has revealed, whether in his word or his works, concerning the scope of his designs. For he that spared not his own Son, but delivered him up for us all, how shall he not with him also freely give us all things?

Here is the true analogy that must control the belief, and ought to satisfy the desires of the Christian—the analogy of faith. If God has created all things by his Son, and if he has given all things to him, and made him the Judge and Lord of all, on account of his work of redemption, then we have in this a fixed rule, and may here find a dominant analogy, by which, all other reasonings and analogies failing, we may come to a firm and definite conclusion, even on a question so difficult as this. It is impossible to make any theory of a plurality of worlds square with the scheme of redemption.

God's moral kingdom, to which the scheme of redemption pertains, is, like his natural kingdom, governed by established laws. It has its fixed principles, as the other has its natural laws. It is based upon the fundamental idea of accountability and retribution. The kingdom of heaven requires for its consummation an innumerable company of holy beings, recovered from a state of sin, and restored to the divine favor through a Redeemer. The complex being, man, made a little lower than the angels in his immortal capacity, and yet affiliated with the brutes in his material nature, is constituted the subject of this grand development. The whole visible world is inferior and subsidiary to this, and only made for it, as means to an end; and so inferior in value, that a man would be the loser to gain the whole of it, and lose his own soul. There is but one Creator, and he has made but one creation. Unity characterizes his work as it does his being. He has one only-begotten Son, and him he has incorporated with this one procedure, as he can be with no other. There is but one redemption, as there is only one Redeemer. Out of these beings, so strangely combining the spiritual with the animal, he is to constitute the kingdom of heaven; and there will be but one kingdom under one King. The bare statement of these great truths is sufficient to secure the assent of the great body of Christian people; and a little reflection must satisfy them

that they are conclusive against the belief in a plurality of worlds. If the supposed inhabitants of those worlds are sinners, which is the only law of life for material beings that we are acquainted with, then they have no redemption. If they are not sinners, then it is practicable to govern material beings without sin; and, therefore, man was not made and treated as he might have been, and has a ground of complaint, that he alone was suffered to fall. If the inhabitants of these bodies are like to human beings, as sensuous and suffering, and without hope, their existence can hardly be thought either pleasing or creditable to a God of infinite benevolence. If they are more elevated, more intellectual, more spiritual, they require a different scene of trial as the test of their virtue. If they are less conscientious and more animalized, and therefore more degraded and less reclaimable, the difficulties are still greater. Whatever way we turn, then, with Christianity in mind, we are met by insurmountable objections to the theory, which can be consistently held only by taking leave of the Bible, and placing ourselves under the guidance of that materialized imagination which unbelievers have called the light of nature.

Art. III.—LIFE AND WRITINGS OF DR. JOHN PYE SMITH.

1. *Memoirs of the Life and Writings of John Pye Smith, D. D., LL. D., F. R. S., F. G. S.* By John Medway. London: Jackson & Walford. 1853. Imperial 8vo., pp. 647.
2. *First Lines of Christian Theology, in the Form of a Syllabus, prepared for the Use of the Students in the Old College, Homerton. With subsequent Additions and Elucidations.* By John Pye Smith, D. D., LL. D., F. R. S., F. G. S. Edited by William Farrer, LL. B. London: Jackson & Walford. 1854. Imperial 8vo., pp. 744.

The reputation of John Pye Smith was not confined to Britain or to Europe. His most important works are almost as well known on this side of the Atlantic as on the other; and indeed, America was forward in acknowledging his merit when he was yet comparatively little known in Britain. His first publication of importance was the Letters to Belsham, the first edition of which bore the date 1804, and the second 1805. This work procured for him his diploma of D. D. from Yale College, New-Haven, under date September 10, 1807, when he was only thirty-three years of age: so that America may well claim a peculiar interest in his life and labours.

John Pye Smith was a Yorkshireman, and his ancestors, so far as they can be traced upward, had been, on both sides, Yorkshire people. A great-uncle, John Pye, after whom he was named, had been from 1745 to 1773 pastor of a Congregational Church in the town of Sheffield. In this town John Pye Smith was born, May 25, 1774. Mrs. Pye survived her husband many years, took a deep interest in the welfare of her great-nephew, and seems to have had considerable influence in forming his character.

The father of Pye Smith, for many years before his death, conducted the business of bookseller in the town of Sheffield. Sheffield has never been a place distinguished for literary culture, and eighty years ago, though it had long been noted for its manufactures of cutlery of several kinds, it was comparatively a small town, containing probably not more than thirty thousand inhabitants. Accordingly we are not surprised to be informed that Mr. Smith's "was almost the only shop in Sheffield worth visiting for classical authors, Latin or Greek divinity, and good old English writers, especially of the age of the Puritans and Nonconformists, of whom and their works he had an extensive knowledge, of which he was very communicative, especially to ministers." Pye Smith's parents, we should add, were Nonconformists of the Congregationalist school, as his ancestors for several generations seem to have been.

His father's shop served John Pye both for "High School" and "University." The only instruction he ever received in classical learning seems to have been privately afforded, in the way of friendship, for a very inadequate period, and in desultory lessons, by the Rev. Jehoiada Brewer, his father's pastor and intimate acquaintance. "Books, and not living teachers, were his early, as they continued to be throughout life his prime, and almost his sole guides in the acquisition of knowledge."

In April, 1790, at the age of nearly sixteen, Pye Smith was bound for five years apprentice to his father; the indenture mentioning the three branches of bookseller, bookbinder and stationer. The shop was now become at once his school and his home. Of the books, he might have said that he was "*totus in illis.*" He was very valuable to his father, and continued to become more so from his knowledge of books of every kind. His father, too, felt, no doubt, a natural pride in the attainments of his son, and looked forward with hope and pleasure to tho prospect of his being permanently associated with himself. A few months before the time when his apprenticeship commenced, it would appear from an extant letter from his father to a friend, that an important change had taken place in the conduct of young Smith, of which the father speaks, at the date of

the letter, written three months after the apprenticeship, in terms of gratitude and hope. Up to this period his character had been independent and decided, and his disposition sanguine; but these elements, unsanctified by grace, must have been to his godly parents the cause of much uneasy apprehension. From this time, however, a change was observable, which, while it left these elements of character still in full force, so sanctified them and brought them under the control of Christian meekness and humility, as to render them only subsidiary to the unfettered development of that manly and conscientious piety which characterized his after years. This, of course, was the turning point of Pye Smith's history. We know from his own statement, that his position as apprentice and assistant in his father's business brought him continually into intercourse with freethinkers of various kinds. The printing-room and the bookseller's shop have ordinarily been much frequented by such persons; and Sheffield from time immemorial has been rather notorious for the number of infidels among its population. In such a situation, if he had hardened himself against the claims and influences of religion, a youth so sanguine and independent—and whose political sympathies and tendencies we know to have been in the direction of the low and visionary radicalism which in that tempestuous season of public events, while France was rioting in the new-found license of her revolutionary epoch, had to a very considerable extent, though in a mitigated form, taken possession of very many of the most ardent, and not, perhaps, the least noble spirits in Britain, including Wordsworth, Southey, and Coleridge—would probably have been led into infidelity; but having yielded to the grace of Christ, the very circumstances which might otherwise have exerted an influence so pernicious, became, under Providence, an important element in that intellectual and spiritual training which prepared him to become the illustrious and successful champion in later years of orthodoxy against Unitarianism, and of Christianity against presumptuous and insolent infidelity.

Pye Smith's conversion was very decisive; the change was not gradual, but sudden and marked; and the contrast was great between what he had been and what, under the influence of converting grace, he suddenly became. We have indeed no particulars of the date and manner of his conversion. The course of Pye Smith's experience was through life a "hidden brook," though it gave out the sweet "music" of a holy and beneficent life and conversation. His spiritual life was, in a peculiar sense, "a life *hid* with Christ in God." Yet this fact of the suddenness and decision with which the bias of his mind was changed, and his character "transformed

by the renewing of his mind," is one which deserves special notice. It seems to have tended greatly to secure his faith and footing as a Christian in days to come. Perhaps the most remarkable feature in Dr. Smith's character was the way in which he combined firmness and tenacity in adherence to the fundamental Christian faith with freedom of investigation as to the evidences of that faith, and large tolerance of opinion as to points not fundamental. He felt that he was securely anchored, and he could calmly note the bearings of all the objects surrounding his position, and take his soundings so as to discriminate between shore and sea-drift, deep and shallow. Knowing that he held by a good bottom, he swung freely and rode at ease. He felt the force of tides and currents, and even of the tempest, from the rage of which he was secure in the haven; yet they never had power to dislodge him from the circle within which he revolved in safety. We know of no man who was his equal in this repect; he had a candid ear for every objection against his faith, he could steadily contemplate the greatest difficulties which surrounded it, he could calmly, though reverently, investigate the most fearful of the mysteries which environ the present state of human existence, and yet his head never seems to have reeled, nor his eye to have blenched, nor his sure trust and confidence to have failed in that truth which, to him, had proved the power of God unto salvation.

Pye Smith was formally admitted a member of the Church under the care of Mr. Brewer, to which his parents belonged, on a profession of his Christian faith and hope, November 21, 1792. We have already stated that his conversion was a decided and a sudden change; yet it appears, from the brief paper containing his profession, which still remains, that his passage from a sense of condemnation and dread to one of confidence and love was *not* momentary, but gradual. Some of the Sabbath memorials which, about this time, he was accustomed to write, are deeply interesting. They show a very devout, earnest, and watchful spirit. About the year 1793, if not earlier, communications took place between young Smith and some of his friends respecting his becoming a minister. His father, however, for a long period after this,—indeed, until some time after he had completed his apprenticeship,—was unwilling to give up his son's services from the business. Perhaps, also, his parents were laudably anxious that he should not "run before he was sent." Meantime young Smith began to show that zeal and concern for the salvation of others which is one of the signs of a genuine conversion.

In 1796 we find Pye Smith in a new and a perilous sphere, supplying the place of his friend James Montgomery, as editor of the

Sheffield Iris, during the time that the poet was suffering imprisonment in York Castle for what had been adjudged, according to the law as it then stood, to be a libel on the conduct of the Sheffield Volunteers in quelling a popular tumult. So decided, perhaps we should say extreme, at this time were Pye Smith's politics, that Montgomery found it necessary gently to moderate his friend's zeal; yet, on the whole, he seems to have conducted the paper during the time it was under his management with prudence as well as competent ability. Many years after this, at the meeting of the Congregational Union in Sheffield, in 1849, James Montgomery dined at the Music Hall with about two hundred and fifty Congregationalist gentlemen. In the course of the proceedings after dinner, he alluded in a very interesting way to his early connexion with Dr. Pye Smith. It appears that they were united in loftier and serener pursuits than any connected with politics. "He occasionally accompanied his friend in preaching expeditions to the villages, to enjoy the benefit of hearing him." In farm-houses, and in barns, he thus attended Pye Smith's early ministry. Surely this association of the Christian poet with the profound, but humble theologian, is more than ordinarily interesting. Montgomery, who survived his friend a little more than two years, has now joined him in a better country, where their several gifts are merged in lowly adoration and enraptured praise.

Pye Smith seems to have begun to preach or exhort about 1793, that is, at nineteen years of age. At first his parents offered some opposition to his engaging in any such work as this. He remained at home not only long enough to complete the term of his apprenticeship, but nearly eighteen months longer; and only left when his own respectful arguments, the concurrent advice of friends, and the direct, but unsought sanction and recommendation of the Church, had at length completely silenced and subdued his father's objections, and secured the cordial, though late approval of his mother, at least, and probably of his father also. This took place in 1796, when Pye Smith was twenty-two years of age. How beautiful to see a young man of so sanguine a temper as we know to have belonged to him, of disposition and principles so independent, and withal of such ability and attainments, deporting himself toward his parents so meekly and unblameably!

At this time it appears he was highly respected in Sheffield. In his own Church, during the pastoral vacancy, he had been occasionally called upon to preside at Church meetings, and to deliver the address to newly-admitted members. In a larger and more public sphere, too, he must have already attracted some attention, mainly,

perhaps, in consequence of his political connexion with Montgomery. Three or four notes remain, addressed to him by Samuel Taylor Coleridge, of about this date. And a little later, we find William Roscoe, author of the *Life of Lorenzo de Medici,* corresponding with him.

No sooner had Pye Smith gained his parents' consent to his devoting himself to the work of the ministry, than he lost no time in procuring entrance to Rotherham College, which was then under the care of Dr. Edward Williams. The Dissenting Colleges, or Academies, of 1796, were not what they are now. The students were few; two tutors sufficed for all branches of instruction; the curriculum was at once more limited and much more superficial than at present; and there was no University at which the alumni of the "Academy" could graduate. Young Smith, destitute as he had been of everything like regular instruction, seems, nevertheless, to have been regarded by his fellow-students as a prodigy of learning. The Latin orations, of which he delivered one yearly during the last three of his four years' residence at College, show a Latinity so vigorous, elevated, and generally pure, that we feel assured not many Oxford men, at that day, could have exceeded these productions of the self-taught son and apprentice of the Sheffield bookseller. His range of reading, too, was very wide. "He was not only a superior linguist, but was skilled in natural history, anatomy, and some branches of medicine." He lectured on anatomy to his fellow-students; and often declaimed from the library rostrum for the instruction and entertainment of his companions on any subject he thought proper.

> "There was one thing in Mr. Smith," says one, who at this time knew him well, "which completely puzzled all the students, if not his tutors also, namely, his time, manner, and course of study. I do not think he had any class-mates except in divinity; for all looked up to him, not as a class-mate, so much as an oracle. They all saw, and probably envied, his treasures of knowledge, newly acquired, flowing in from *some* quarter, but could not imagine where he had them; as they had apparently the same sources, as to books, instruction, &c. It was observed that he never appeared a hard, *fagging* student, nor a plodding reader poring his eyes out over books. He seemed to tear out their entrails by violence; and one might almost think him an exception to the common aphorism, *sine labore dii dant nil mortalibus.* He paid occasional visits among his numerous friends; and took his regular turn to supply distant congregations, and probably was in no excessive hurry home to the muses. Yet his mind was always at work, always in advance, always accumulating. I believe the whole secret was his most uncommon quickness of perception and judgment, which enabled him to see through systems of every kind at a glance, or with comparatively little application, though, doubtless, he must have had his *toilsome moments,* as well as inferior minds. His piety at college, a place often trying to the piety of young students, was kept up by diligent private devotion, and by the regular perusal of practical works of religion, such as Baxter's *Saint's Rest,* Halyburton's Life, and several of Flavel's writings."—*Memoirs,* p. 49.

Mr. Smith left Rotherham College in 1800. His character was already so far established that, prior to the completion of his fourth year at college, negotiations were entered upon with reference to his undertaking the office of classical tutor at Coward College, then situated at Wymondley, in Hertfordshire. In connexion with this negotiation he visited Wymondley toward the close of 1799. "During this visit he was strongly impressed with a sense of the importance of providing for a probationary term of three months' residence, before any young man was to be considered as fully admitted to the benefits of the college." His object was to gain satisfactory evidence of the true conversion of the candidates for admission. Not being able to agree with the authorities upon this point, he turned his back upon Wymondley one winter's day, and resumed his studies at Rotherham. The point upon which Mr. Smith differed from the managers of Coward College was one upon which his views remained unaltered to the last. Indeed, time only strengthened them, and he lived to see his principle universally recognized in orthodox colleges. He thus expresses his sentiments upon this point, in the "Observations and Advices addressed to a Student entering upon his Theological Studies," which form the introduction to the "First Lines of Christian Theology:"—

> "*I take for granted* that you are a TRUE CHRISTIAN, born again of the Holy Spirit, washed, and justified, and sanctified, taking up your cross daily, and following the holy Jesus. If you are, at this moment, conscious of the contrary—if your own heart bears witness that you have never known a saving renewal unto vital holiness—I charge you, in the name of the eternal and most holy Jehovah, and by all the terrors of his most tremendous and fiery wrath, *to stop here.* If you presume to advance, know that every step you take is a swift approach to hell—that every line you write is a sentence of damnation. *Stop here nor dare to proceed* till your hypocrisy and wickedness are forgiven you—till you have solid reason to conclude that you are no longer in the gall of bitterness and the bond of iniquity.
>
> "O merciful, almighty, and most holy Saviour! never, never permit an unregenerate wretch, however deep his self-delusion and specious his profession, to pass this boundary and become a curse to thy blessed cause, and the author of ten-fold destruction to his own soul! Amen! Amen!"—*First Lines of Theology*, pp. 2, 3.

The firmness and decision manifested by Pye Smith on this point at so early a period of his life, and when his position was as yet to be gained, are very remarkable, and equally creditable. It is not, however, likely that, apart from this, he could have found a congenial or permanent home at Wymondley, since some of the trustees of Coward College at this time held Arian views.

Although Mr. Smith had been willing to enter upon the engagements of classical tutor, yet he did not on that account, at this time, nor, indeed, did he at any time, give up his conviction that he was

called of God to occupy the pastoral office. The latter he felt was his primary vocation; the other might be collaterally combined with it, or merged in it and made subsidiary thereto. He might be tutor and pastor, or tutor over those to whom he also discharged the office of pastor; but having the pastoral call and the pastoral heart, he could not be satisfied without performing pastoral service and work. Hence we are informed by his biographer that "soon after his return to Rotherham, and before the close of his term of residence, he went to Chester, to supply a vacant pulpit, with a view to the pastoral office in that city." Here his ministry seems to have been highly acceptable; yet, for some reason, he did not enter on the vacant charge. Probably his attention was turned in another direction by an application which was made to his tutor and to himself, in the same year, (1800,) in reference to his undertaking the classical tutorship at Homerton College. He accepted the invitation, and entered upon his duties at Homerton with the new year —1801.

Homerton College was, we believe, the oldest theological seminary connected with the Nonconformists in England. It was established in the year 1743, and was a fruit of the coalescence of two Dissenting institutions, the Congregational Fund Board and the King's-Head Society. The former of these was established in 1695, to assist poor congregations in the support of their ministers, and to provide for the education of suitable young men for the ministry. The latter institution dates from the year 1730, and was intended to provide means for resisting the spread of the prevailing errors of the day, by setting forth the opposing fundamental truths of evangelical doctrine, and also, like the Congregational Fund Board, by training candidates for the Christian ministry in the principles of orthodoxy and practice of piety. This "society" held its periodical meetings at a godly hostelry, known by the sign of the *King's-Head*, the proprietor of which was one of its members. From this somewhat remarkable circumstance, the society received its distinctive name This society established a weekly lecture during certain months of the year. The lecturers were, of course, Congregational ministers, and their lectures were regularly published. Subsequently, this became a monthly lecture, and, in after years, Dr. Pye Smith was frequently called upon to be the lecturer. Eventually it dwindled to a yearly sermon, and about 1827 it wholly ceased. Homerton College was managed by a committee, representing both the institutions of which we have spoken, and was maintained till the year 1850. In that year the present new college was formed by the coalition of the interests respectively represented in Homerton,

Highbury and Coward colleges, when, of course, the separate existence of these three institutions terminated. We may add that Coward College was the same in which Doddridge had taught at Northampton, and Belsham at Daventry, and from which Pye Smith had turned away at Wymondley. It is to be feared that Doddridge, great and pious a divine as he undoubtedly was, had yet prepared the way for the heterodoxy which had already tainted the college, when Belsham became its tutor. During Belsham's presidency we need not say that first Arianism, and then decided Socinianism had extensively leavened the institution; and when Pye Smith turned away from its doors, we have already seen that Arianism was still the creed of some of its managing trustees. In after years, however, Coward College is understood to have become truly orthodox. We may be sure that otherwise it would scarcely have been merged in the new college, over which Dr. Harris so worthily presides.

Pye Smith's "Address to the Students of the Congregational Academy at Homerton, delivered on occasion of entering upon the office of Resident Tutor," is reprinted in full in his biography. It is remarkable for its spirit of Christian meekness and its tone of graceful, brotherly courtesy. In this repect it is a beautiful model of the manner in which a young tutor should address himself to win and guide his pupil-brethren. But the course which he sketched for himself was undoubtedly far too large to be filled up properly by any one man, however energetic and accomplished, or to be gone over by the students in four years. It embraced "three successive and connected courses of lectures" on natural philosophy, chemistry, and natural history, and a fourth on astronomy; courses of lectures on logic, ontology, and rhetoric; and in the study and use of history; regular studies in elementary mathematics; a course of exegetical lectures on the New Testament, and lectures and exercises on classical literature and on the Hebrew tongue. This outline, however, serves to show the extent of the territory which Pye Smith had himself, to a large extent, overrun and mastered, and exhibits his views as to the necessity of large and liberal culture in all departments of sterling knowledge—and especially in natural science, as not less important than literature—in order fully and adequately to furnish a minister of the gospel for the position which he ought to occupy as priest of truth for the God of the Bible, tithing all for his glory, bringing into his temple the first-fruits of all, that his proprietorship may be vindicated, and all be sanctified to him. Too often has science been the votary of false gods and usurping idols. This must be so, if the ministers of the true God will not com-

mand her allegiance to their God—if they sullenly scowl at her tokens, and mock or anathematize her discoveries. Pye Smith saw from the first—much earlier than Chalmers himself—what was the right course to be taken in this matter. In this inaugural address at Homerton, we discover the same characteristics which, in after years, gave him as wide a fame, in one circle, by his lectures on geology, as he had previously acquired, in other circles, by his "Scripture Testimony to the Messiah." The work which for many years he tried to compass at Homerton, but which it was impossible for any one man really to accomplish, he lived to see provided for in the new college by a large and competent staff of professors.

When Pye Smith entered Homerton College, and for many years after, the classical tutor was also the college president, and had the entire economical management and responsibility of the college. This was an onerous situation for an inexperienced bachelor, especially as the allowances for expenses were calculated on obsolete data, and on a very low scale. Moreover, 1801 was a famine year in Britain, the average price of wheat for the year being about double the price of plentiful years. Under these circumstances, Mr. Smith allowed himself to contract a hasty and ill-assorted marriage with a lady of property. She was, indeed, a person of education, abilities, and Christian character, and had recently left the Church of England and embraced Dissenting principles. But she was a woman of a parsimonious disposition and of an imperious will. Her parsimony was aggravated and rapidly developed, because of the circumstances under which she began housekeeping, and of the pecuniary difficulties under which her husband laboured for several years. But it grew into a dreary monomania, which all the arguments and entreaties of her husband, sometimes most pathetically and powerfully urged in writing, could not mitigate. Such a character as hers seriously interfered with Mr. Smith's relations to the students, so that in 1807 he was compelled to resign his office into the hands of the managing committee of the college; on which occasion, however, the committee showed their high esteem of his character and services, by requesting him to undertake the office of Divinity Tutor, a request to which he acceded. Still, however, the evil influence was most painfully felt by Mr. Smith, even though non-resident. His house was a seclusion to which no student or friend could be invited, his correspondence was painfully restricted, his private library was seldom enlarged by the purchase of a volume, his precious time was frittered away, when not in college, by occupations which should have been undertaken by domestic helps of another order, and his means of beneficence were most unhappily curtailed. Add

to this, that his children were not taught to reverence their excellent father, though, indeed, they did so, and could not but do so; and our readers may conceive the cup of domestic affliction which for thirty years Pye Smith had ever to drink. What made the whole yet more painful was, that for many years of this time there was not the slightest reason for any such feelings as Mrs. Smith entertained. She dreaded poverty in the midst of affluence. How alien all this was from Pye Smith's temper and principles became at once apparent as soon as the death of his wife gave him the opportunity to reverse, in every respect, the course which he had maintained. Some may think that Dr. Smith should, at all hazards, have broken through this bondage. But what this might have cost who can calculate? Nor could a minister in his position, or of his spirit, have risked or borne a public exposure. He endured this as his trial—as his thorn in the flesh—meekly and in faith. He felt, no doubt, that in part he had brought it upon himself; and we have ample evidence that this great calamity and sore trial was richly sanctified to him.

In 1802 Pye Smith commenced a mineralogical collection, which he continued to increase, more or less, from that time. Mineralogy seems to have been a favourite science with him, until this was merged in geology. In 1803 he published—several other publications having preceded in former years—a discourse, entitled, *The Divine Glory displayed in the Permission of Sin.* This was delivered at the *monthly lecture*, to which we have before referred, as were ten others of his published discourses. We refer to it, however, as an instance of the calmness with which Pye Smith could contemplate the deepest mysteries, to look at which steadily would have made most other heads reel. He appears in this sermon as the decided Necessitarian and Calvinist, a worthy disciple of Jonathan Edwards and Dr. Williams. Such he remained till the end of his days. He maintains that "sin is a privation, an absence, a defect, not among the number of positive beings," and, therefore, "not among the creatures which the Almighty Maker has formed." He further maintains the two following propositions:—"1. The sole and proper origination of sin is from the *necessary* condition and circumstances of created and finite existence, when destitute of a sovereign prevention." "2. The acknowledged fact, that God did not interfere to prevent the occurrence of sin, was an exercise *not of sovereignty*, but of PURE JUSTICE." (See *Memoirs*, p. 118.) By all, we suppose, but Calvinists, these two propositions would be thought mutually inconsistent. Pye Smith, however, held that both were true, and both consistent. This, at least, is bold and resolute Calvinism. Pye Smith was a *real* Calvinist, and understood his creed. He

was, however, as an expositor of Scripture, a very moderate Calvinist; and, practically, he was most tolerant and liberal in his judgment of persons of another creed, however diametrically opposed to his own. His Calvinism does not seem to have been at all the deduction of his Scripture inquiries, but a logical inference from his philosophy and metaphysics. He belonged to what has been loosely called the sensationalist school of philosophy, was an admirer of Hartley, loved by a strict logic to embrace and investigate all things, and applied the principles of physics to spiritual affections and acts. Hence he became a philosophical Necessitarian, and a Calvinist in religious doctrine.

In 1804 Pye Smith became, with the concurrence of the authorities of the college, pastor of a very small Church, then first formed, in connexion with the college, and assembling for worship at first in the hall of the college. The number was only seven, including Mr. Smith; but in the course of years the Church grew into a considerable body. A few years afterward it occupied the Old Gravel-pit Meeting-house, then just vacant by the removal of Mr. Belsham, where it still meets. Of this Church Pye Smith was pastor forty-five years. His pastoral experience and engagements heightened and ripened all his other qualifications for the office of Divinity Tutor. In connexion with his engaging in the office of pastor, Pye Smith drew up two documents, one a "Church covenant," which is remarkable, because, while very explicit on all points of catholic, Christian, and evangelical doctrine, it entirely avoids any reference to the peculiarities of the Calvinistic creed; the other, a "confession of faith," read by himself on occasion of his public ordination to the pastoral office, and which is equally remarkable for the perspicuity and fulness with which it states his views on all the main points of Christian doctrine, as held by decided, though not extreme Calvinists. The distinction between these documents may be easily accounted for. Though a decided Calvinist himself, and bound clearly and fully to state his own doctrine before his ministerial brethren, Pye Smith was no bigot, and did not wish to preclude any evangelical Christian from communion with his own Church.

Mr. Smith's position at Homerton had brought him into immediate contact with the Rev. Thomas Belsham. For seventy or eighty years the Old Gravel-pit Meeting-house, Homerton, had had a succession of Arian or Socinian ministers. First Dr. Price, then Dr. Priestley, and then Mr. Belsham, had preached there. Mr. Belsham was the minister from 1794 to 1805, when he removed to Essex-street Chapel, in the Strand, London. On the death of Dr. Priestley in 1804, Mr. Belsham preached a commemorative discourse

at Homerton, which he published, and of which he sent a copy to Mr. Smith. This discourse Mr. Smith felt it his duty to answer. Hence the *Letters to Belsham*, which were published in 1804, and again a second edition in less than twelve months after. We have seen that while still comparatively a youth at Sheffield, Pye Smith had been led to examine carefully, and, we might almost say, controversially, the cardinal doctrine of Christ's Godhead. In his position at Homerton in 1804, we mark another in that train of circumstances which, under Providence, prepared him for the great work of his life, the production of a complete, condensed, conclusive argument on the subject. The *Letters to Belsham* were candid, courteous, learned, and able. They at once produced a great impression; and many Christians, from this time, looked to the young tutor at Homerton, then in his thirty-first year, whose maiden-work on this controversy gave such evidence of calm and modest power, as the future champion of orthodoxy in this argument. Need, indeed, there was that some one should arise to do battle for the truth. The ability of Dr. Price, the reputation of Priestley, the learning of Wakefield, the conversion from orthodoxy of Theophilus Lindsay, once a clergyman of the Church of England, the plausibility and assurance of Belsham, had carried the hopes of Unitarianism in a shallow and feeble age, when, beyond the pale of Methodism, there was little good and nothing powerful, to a greater height than they have reached before or since. But already Wardlaw in the north, and Smith in the south of Britain, were beginning to bestir themselves and to set the battle of Scripture truth in array against the Socinian foe. The "Letters to Belsham" procured for Dr. Smith the diploma of D. D. from Yale College in 1807: so early did America recognize the merit of the young divine.

The *Eclectic Review* was commenced in January, 1805. From the first Pye Smith contributed to this Review, and he continued to do so as long as his energy served him for periodical writing at all. The number and variety of his articles on subjects of science and classical literature, as well as of sacred criticism and general religious interest, attest his extraordinary diligence and manifold accomplishments. In 1806 we find him setting an excellent example for a college tutor, by engaging in out-of-door preaching. Upon his doing this, the vicar of Homerton addressed to him a courteous remonstrance, which called forth from Mr. Smith a defence of what he had done. In 1807 he was mainly instrumental in originating Mill-Hill Protestant Dissenters' Grammar School, (near London,) the quarterly examinations of which he attended with punctual exactness and fatherly interest, till within a year of his decease.

Upon the first day that this school was opened, Richard Winter Hamilton and Thomas Noon Talfourd entered it. The former became afterward a Dissenting minister, resident from first to last, we believe, at Leeds, and distinguished as an accomplished wit and man of letters, a profound divine, an eloquent preacher and writer, and a catholic Christian; a most genial, kindly man. The latter became afterward the poet, scholar, and judge; and expired when in the act of impressing upon a British grand jury sentiments the most enlightened, benevolent, and Christian, in reference to the mutual relations of the different classes of his countrymen.

From 1805, Mr. Smith had provisionally discharged the office of Divinity Tutor as well as Classical Tutor. In December, 1807, he received the resident tutorship; and in 1808 he removed to a new residence, as Divinity Tutor. From this date we must speak of him as Dr. Pye Smith. He was now engaged in his *proper* work. However competent he might be for the classical tutorship, his heart was in divinity. Sacred science was his most congenial study. To this all else in his wide range of inquiries converged; the home and end of all his contemplations was the knowledge of God. His instructions as Divinity Tutor embraced a purely theological course, the syllabus of which in its most complete form, and ably edited and supplemented, is now published as the "First Lines of Theology," of which we have given the full title at the head of this paper; Lectures on Ecclesiastical History, said to have been exceedingly complete and valuable; Lectures on Biblical Antiquities, and Criticism on Polemical Divinity, and the Exegesis of the New Testament. He still continued, also, to lecture on Mental and Moral Philosophy, Rhetoric, and various branches of Natural Science. He also required the students in rotation to deliver a discourse before himself and the class as a pulpit exercise. As Homerton College was not capable of accommodating many students, the number never much exceeding twenty, Dr. Smith's theological class seldom contained more than ten or twelve students. It may be proper to mention that from the time of his entering Homerton, Pye Smith's pulpit services had been in much request, and that they continued to be so for years after this time.

In 1811 Dr. Smith's congregation for the first time entered upon the occupancy of the chapel which Mr. Belsham had recently vacated, the Old Gravel-pit Meeting-house. The following year a circumstance occurred which created a great deal of excitement at the time, and which is strikingly illustrative of the character of Dr. Smith. At this period he was unsettled in his views in reference to the intermediate state; and he frankly stated his condition of mind

to his congregation, in a sermon on 2 Cor. v, 1–4. After a more thorough study of the subject, he again preached on the same text, and presented the evidence in favour of the prevailing belief among Christians, in a light at once satisfactory to himself and to his people.

This affair, combined with *perhaps* some other instances of similarly honest, but probably unguarded frankness in intercourse with his pupils, led to rumours and suspicions very seriously affecting Dr. Smith's position as theological tutor. The sudden withdrawment of one of the students, after only a few weeks' residence at Homerton, added to the growing prejudice. Under these circumstances he felt it necessary to call for an inquiry. The inquiry terminated most honourably for Dr. Smith, nine out of eleven of the committee agreeing in a report which substantially exculpated the theological tutor, and expressed the strongest confidence in his orthodoxy. The two dissentients, however, appealed to the press, and the consequence was that Dr. Smith published by way of rejoinder three pamphlets in quick succession, extending to one hundred and sixty pages, and bearing the title of *Vindiciæ Academicæ* and *Sequel to Vindiciæ Academicæ.* In these he says:—

> "Perhaps I have carried my notion of the duty of openness and the evil of reserve to an excess. But to this side still would I incline, rather than to its opposite of concealments and reservations. . . . . If in relation to some of the most difficult questions that can occupy the attention of the human mind, I have paused, and paused long, before I could venture to draw a positive conclusion;—if I have declined to confound the gradations of moral evidence in one undistinguishing and headstrong pretence of confidence;—if, so long as hesitation existed, I have not refused to own it, when a just occasion demanded the acknowledgment;—this will not greatly surprise nor deeply offend the man of sense or the thinking Christian."—*Memoirs*, p. 207.

There is force in these apologies; yet surely it must be confessed that it is a thing extremely undesirable that a theological tutor should not have fully settled, after whatever amount of careful examination, his own convictions on all points of principal or even secondary importance, before he undertakes to be the guide and instructor of youthful students. By the time this painful controversy was brought to an end, letters of congratulation had reached Dr. Smith from many quarters; and, among the rest, one was received, of a very cordial character, from Robert Hall, who had had his own struggles of a similar description.

During the same year in which the discussion to which we have referred took place, 1813, Dr. Smith, besides preparing and publishing an ordination-charge, published the most elaborate of his printed discourses, that on *The Sacrifice of Christ*, (which formed the basis

of his well-known and admirable work, long afterward published, on *The Sacrifice and Priesthood of Christ*,) with notes as long as the text. And for the last five months of the year, the health of the classical tutor having failed, he discharged his duties in addition to his own, and sustained the whole burden of tuition. He had done this before, and did it again and again in later years. Let us say in this place, that, in the present sketch, we do not pretend to catalogue all Dr. Smith's numerous publications, and take no notice whatever of the varied and valuable contributions which he was continually furnishing to the Eclectic Review.

In 1818 Dr Smith published the first volume of his greatest work, *The Scripture Testimony to the Messiah.* Just as he was preparing to send it forth to the world, he suffered a most painful bereavement in the removal, at the age of fourteen, of his eldest son, Philip Henry, who appears to have been a most interesting and promising youth. He had lost before an infant child, his father, and a sister. But this was the keenest sorrow of his life. He refers to it in a most affecting passage in the preface to the first edition of the *Scripture Testimony*, which we quote because this preface has been omitted from the later editions of the work :—

> "Scarcely has he sent the last sheets to the press when all his other feelings are swallowed up in one keen distress. He had a son, the joy of his heart, and the object of many a delightful, though trembling, anticipation. When these anticipations were beginning to be realized; when he was just stepping into the place of an associate and a friend; when his character and attainments were opening to prospects of exquisite gratification; in the very fulness of life, health, and vigour, it has pleased the all-wise and righteous Sovereign to take him from the arms of his agonized parents by a sudden and overwhelming stroke.
>
> "'Non sum ambitiosus in malis, nec augere lacrymarum caussas volo: utinamque esset ratio minuendi! Sed dissimulare qui possum, quid illi gratiæ in vultu, quid jucunditatis in sermone, quos ingenii igniculos, quam præstantiam placidæ mentis ostenderit? Tuos ne ego, O meæ spes inanes, labentes oculos, tuum fugientem spiritum vidi? Tuum corpus frigidum, exsangue complexus—animam recipere, auramque communem haurire amplius potui?' "[*]
>
> "But though the bereaved and sorrowing writer can so justly borrow these lamentations, he cherishes a *hope* which that illustrious mourner never knew." —*Memoirs*, p. 237.

If any doubt on the subject which five years before had so perplexed and distressed his mind, might occasionally have risen up again to disturb his peace, may we not feel assured that all such doubts were now laid to rest in the sepulchre of this beloved son; and that, as Robert Hall is said to have buried his materialism in his father's grave, so Pye Smith from this time ceased not to look upon the "intermediate state" as one in which all the dead "live unto God?"

---

[*] Quintilian, Instit., lib. vi, Proœm.

The *Scripture Testimony* was announced, it would seem, in 1812; but it was 1818 before even the first volume appeared. To this the author refers in the "Preface" from which we have already quoted. We cannot quote the passage in full. Suffice it to say, that it affords a melancholy glimpse into the domestic obstructions which had so greatly impeded the progress of the vigorous and industrious writer. "Had he been able," he says, "to bestow upon this work as many months of unbroken time as have elapsed of years since it was begun, it would long ago have been completed."—*Memoirs*, p. 100. The second volume of this work was published in 1821, extending, in its original form, to more than eight hundred pages.

In 1826 Dr. Smith addressed a letter to his friend Robert Haldane, on the subject of inspiration, from which we shall give an extract. Mr. Haldane was an adherent of the theory of verbal inspiration, in its most extreme form. Dr. Smith says:—

> "Your style of writing seems to *imply* it to be essential to the character of a genuine disciple of the Lord Jesus that he hold that the INSPIRATION of the Scriptures consisted in this, that every phrase and word of the Scriptures was suggested, or enjoined by the Holy Spirit to the writers; so that, in fact, theirs was, or at least needed to be, no other than a mechanical labour. Permit me to request your kind, but rigorous and scrutinizing attention to some brief remarks on this subject, in a work entitled 'Scripture Testimony to the Messiah,' vol. i, pp. 62, 63, and 27–29. Allow me also to ask and observe some things which now occur to me:—1. How is this view of inspiration to be transferred to any *versions?* 2. It appears to me to be clogged with very serious and inextricable difficulties; and that the contending for it is likely to bring great detriment to the evidence and interests of evangelical truth. At the same time it is one of those subjects which ought to be considered and settled without any respect of favour or disfavour to any system of doctrine. 3. After the attention of about thirty years to this subject, a view, of which the following is an outline, appears to me to be the *truth* on this subject. Yet I trust I have well considered what you have advanced in your excellent work on the 'Evidences and Authority of Divine Revelation:'—
>
> "1. That the essential seat of the inspiration lies in the *thoughts and sentiments*, whatever be the variety of phrase by which they may be expressed. The inspiration of God, therefore, extends to all metaphrases and translations, provided they be *equipollent* in meaning.
>
> "2. That though the inspired writers used the diction which was most familiar to them, according to their characteristic style and verbal habits, yet in all cases the original Hebrew, Chaldee, or Greek, is the best expression of the 'mind of the Spirit.' For either the very words and phrases were suggested by the Holy Spirit, (most probably so in prophetic declarations and messages,) or were accepted, so to speak, by him; which two cases are precisely the same in practical effect.
>
> "3. That, in historical narration, (under which I include all relations of the feelings, fears, sorrows, temptations, deliverances, &c., of individual believers, or of the Church as a body; e. g., the Book of Job, that of Lamentations, and many of the Psalms,) all that we want are due selection and faithful statement; and these inspiration secures.
>
> "4. That, in the didactic parts, the apostles, &c., wrote as they were in the habit of speaking. Each, in both kinds of communication, uttered what he had 'seen and heard,' what 'he had received from the Lord,' in the entire

exercise of his own judgment and affections, and with, it may be, a perpetual variety of expression, *pro re natâ*, yet with a full consciousness of being taught and guided infallibly by the Holy Spirit."

To the letter from which the above is extracted no direct reply was ever given by Mr. Haldane. Soon afterward, however, Dr. Smith became involved in a controversy, carried on in the pages of the Evangelical Magazine, on the same subject, with Mr. James Alexander Haldane, the brother of Mr. Robert Haldane, who concealed his name under the signature *Aletheia.* This was before the end of the year 1826. The following year, however, the whole controversy was reopened, in another form, by Dr. Alexander Carson, who attacked Dr. Smith in a style which, for truculence and atrocity, has, perhaps, never been exceeded even under the inspiration of the *odium theologicum.* Dr. Smith is stigmatized as a traitor. and more dangerous than an open infidel; and as actuated by "a false, a diabolical liberality." All who do not accept the most extreme views of verbal inspiration, are set down as guilty of implicit infidelity. Indeed, the object of the writer might have been to narrow, as far as possible, the limits within which a Christian faith is possible, and to drive as fast and as hard as possible all who might not be able to adopt his own views as to the *mode* of inspiration into open and universal infidelity. Dr. Smith, of course, never replied to *this* publication. He never took the slightest notice of it. A minister and divine of his eminent piety and exalted position *could not* do so. In his discussions of the question of inspiration in the later editions of the *Scripture Testimony* he refers respectfully, though dissentingly, to the published views of Mr. Robert Haldane on this subject; but to the "pastor of Tubbermore" he never makes the slightest allusion. Little, we presume, did he suspect what is now confessed in the memoirs of the brothers Haldane, published by Mr. Alexander Haldane, that Dr. Carson was prompted by Mr. Robert Haldane to do this work; that this was, in effect, Mr. Haldane's way of replying to Dr. Smith's letter from which we have quoted, and of coming to the rescue of his brother, ("Aletheia;") that he paid all the expenses of this illiberal and ferocious publication, and gratuitously distributed it by hundreds. Yet such was the fact, as it now appears. We confess it is with deep grief that we mention, though we cannot but mention, a circumstance so discreditable to the character of a Christian so distinguished, so useful, and so benevolent as the late Robert Haldane. We may add that Dr. Smith's maturest views as to the question of inspiration may be found in a lucid, condensed, and complete form, in his *Scripture Testimony*, 4th ed., vol. i. He had long doubted as to the canonical authority

of the "Song of Solomon;" but the arguments of some able writers in the Congregational Magazine, (1837–8,) particularly of Dr. James Bennett, had finally convinced him of the canonicity of this book; though as to its purpose and interpretation, he remained still at fault. Dr. Smith's idea of inspiration was not low and rationalizing, otherwise he had doubted less. All his theology, all his faith and hope and peace, were grounded upon the divine authority and infallible truth of Scripture. Hence his conscientious and scrutinizing care in settling the question as to what was entitled to be accounted Scripture. It was necessary that his fulcrum should be firmly fixed before he could apply his lever.

In 1828 Dr. Smith published his *Four Discourses on the Sacrifice and Priesthood of Jesus Christ.* In 1829 he preached at the "Monthly Lecture," and afterward published, his very valuable discourse *On the Principles of Interpretation as applied to the Prophecies.* In the same year he prepared the second edition of the *Scripture Testimony,* "much improved and enlarged," besides several valuable articles in the Eclectic Review, and other separate publications. In the same year also appeared the second edition of his *Scripture Test,* in three volumes. In 1826 he had prepared, by request, and published an able reply to the *manifesto* of the Rev. (!) Robert Taylor, A. B., at that time notorious as the principal leader of a party infamous for bold and blasphemous infidelity. The fourth edition of this work, much enlarged, and including a rejoinder, as the third had done, to Taylor's "Syntagma of the Evidences of the Christian Religion," was published in 1830. The style of this work, though condensed, is remarkably spirited. His sermon on the *Interpretation of Prophecy* was also reprinted this year, in an improved and much enlarged form. In 1832 he lost a most beloved daughter; the same year, also, Mrs. Pye Smith finished her course. The years 1834 and 1835 were signalized by his controversy with his friend Dr. Lee, the Cambridge professor, raised by the latter on a work of Dr. Smith's which expounded the principles of dissent. He did his part in this controversy with great vigour and ability. Within little less than twelve months he carried through the press nearly two hundred and fifty pages of well-digested and carefully written controversy. It need not be said that the temper was admirable; and it is very much to the credit of both the controversialists, that when their discussions had closed, their Christian friendship remained unimpaired. Dr. Smith allowed Professor Lee to have the last word. But his health yielded to these excessive labours; fever and debility supervened, and for a year or two after this his health was feeble.

About this time Dr. Smith had begun to devote special attention to the subject of geology; he had become a regular attendant at the annual meetings of the British Association; and in November, 1836, he became a Fellow of the Geological Society. He soon acquired the acquaintance and friendship of such distinguished geologists as Phillips, Lyell, Buckland, and Sedgwick, with more than one of whom he corresponded; and so he became prepared to undertake, at less than a month's notice, the Congregational Lecture for 1839, on *Revelation and Geology.* This work established his reputation in a new field, and brought him letters of thanks and congratulation, not only from such men of science as Conybeare, Phillips and Mantell in England, but from Professors Hitchcock and Silliman on this side of the Atlantic. It also procured him admission to the Fellowship of the Royal Society, in 1840; an honour which Dr. Doddridge had solicited, but failed to obtain, and for which Smith was proposed and recommended, among others, by Bell, Lyell, Buckland, and Sedgwick.

In 1843 Dr. Smith married a second time; and soon after urged the Committee of Homerton College to allow him to relinquish £100 per annum of his stipend as professor. He again and again afterward urged this request, but the committee would never consent. The same year, after an absence of thirty-six years, he returned to the college as resident tutor—now under different circumstances. In 1845 a number of articles from the pen of Dr. Smith appeared in Kitto's Cyclopædia. These were on the subjects, "Adam," "Dispersion of the Nations," "Nimrod," "Noah," "Paradise," and "Confusion of Tongues."

The fourth edition of the *Scripture Testimony,* reduced from three volumes to two, appeared in 1847. The matter is admirably condensed; the arrangement of the work seems to be perfect; and the edition is, in all respects, a model of elegance and completeness. His *Sacrifice and Priesthood of Jesus Christ* reached a third edition in this same year, 1847. This standard work forms a beautiful supplement to the treatise on the person of Christ. Together they form an admirable compendium of doctrine on the essentials of Christianity—the person and work of Christ.

In 1848 the lectures on *Scripture and Geology* reached a fourth edition. Each successive edition was carefully revised and supplemented in accordance with the latest discoveries of science. The following year Dr. Smith attended, with great interest, the Peace Congress at Paris. By this time his strength was almost spent, he was slightly paralyzed, and though he still continued to discharge his college duties, it was plain that his day was almost past. Indeed, it

was already settled that as soon as the new college was opened, for establishing which preparations were being made, his functions would be at an end. In 1849 he finally resigned his pastorship, after a ministerial service of forty-five years, having for several years previously been aided by a co-pastor. In May, 1850, he prepared the address for the occasion of laying the first stone of the new college, but was unable to read it himself. In June he wished to attend, for the last time, the public examination of Mill Hill Grammar School, but being unable, prepared an address, which was read by Dr. William Smith—a scholar whose attainments are known throughout the learned world. On June 27 he delivered an address, full of touching interest, at the last anniversary of Homerton College. On October 2 he retired from Homerton, which had been the scene of his labours for nearly fifty years, to Guildford, Surrey, situated at a convenient distance from the metropolis. Here he soon became extremely feeble. He gave up all books but the Bible, and such as *Bunyan's Pilgrim*. He had hoped that rest would recruit him, and that he should be able to carry out plans of revised and extended study; but his work was done, and it was time for him to cease. Still, however, when he could do nothing else, and the effort was extremely painful to him, he exerted to the uttermost his small remaining strength to meet the requirements of friendship, courtesy, and charity, by correspondence, until at length two or three lines were all that he could write. On January 8, 1851, he made a great effort to meet his friends at the London Tavern, in order to receive the *Pye Smith Testimonial*, which was a sum of £2,600, of which the interest was to be enjoyed by himself during his life, and after his death was to be devoted to the maintenance of "Pye Smith Scholarships" at the new college. From this time he rapidly declined, and on the night of February 5, 1851, he expired at Guildford, in the presence of his wife and family, aged seventy-six years, eight months, and eleven days. His last publication, which came out at the beginning of this year, was a second edition of the sermon "On the Reasons of the Protestant Religion; enlarged and adapted to the Popish Aggression of 1850, with some Remarkable Disclosures of Romanist Policy in the Age of the Reformation."

A few remarks upon the character of Dr. Smith, in the various relations which he sustained to the Church and to society, will fitly close this paper.

Pye Smith was a self-taught scholar. He never went to a classical school; indeed, scarcely went to school at all. He never had a

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

tutor, though, as we have said, a private friend gave him a few desultory lessons in the classics. No university or college of fame gave to him its ample stores and systematic training. The only college he ever entered was an humble dissenting academy for educating gospel ministers; and his classical course, if course it may be called, was in effect complete before he entered there. In all things except theology he was esteemed by his companions less as a fellow-student than as an unfailing oracle. Yet, in after life, Pye Smith was recognised as a mate in scholarship by the greatest scholars of his day, who had been nurtured within the classic cloisters of the national universities, and upheld their honour before the world. From the establishment of the Eclectic Review in 1805, he sustained for many years nearly the whole weight of its department of classical criticism, and in this work he won for himself a high reputation from the most competent judges. His masterly critique on Dr. (afterward Bishop) Middleton's work on the Greek article, drew from that distinguished scholar a highly complimentary acknowledgment, although the name of the reviewer was unknown to him. Two years later (1810) Dr. Samuel Butler, who was supposed to be, perhaps, the best classical scholar then living in Britain—for Porson was no more—addressed to Dr. Smith a note of thanks not less complimentary in acknowledgment of a review on the first volume of Butler's Stanley's Æschylus, which he had contributed to the Eclectic. After the publication of the first volume of his *Scripture Testimony*, Dr. Smith's reputation as both a classical and a Biblical scholar and critic rose higher and spread further, and from this time we find the most distinguished divines and scholars of the Anglican Church counting it no degradation to become the correspondents of the Dissenting Tutor at Homerton, stiff Nonconformist and Old-school Puritan though he was. Dr. Turton (now Bishop of Ely) and Dr. Burton, both Bampton lecturers, and eminently learned divines; Professor Lee, the Orientalist scholar of Cambridge: Dr. Cardwell, the present principal of St. Alban's Hall, Oxford; the High Churchman Dr. Routh, late president of Magdalen College, Oxford, and who has lately died in his hundredth year;* even Dr. Blomfield, the present Bishop of London; nay, Dr. Pusey himself (prior to the distinct development of Puseyism) were numbered among the friendly correspondents, and some of them among the personal acquaintances of Dr. Smith. In this country we should not think much of this; but in England—old, aristocratic, epis-

---

* Of Dr. Smith's friendship and correspondence with Dr. Routh nothing is said in the *Memoirs;* but see the *Scripture Testimony*, vol. ii, p. 125.

copal England—with its pomp and pride of Church and university—it is altogether unexampled. Such men as Doddridge and Watts have been friendly with a few of the most liberal bishops and leading clergy of their day; but then they were Nonconformists of a much milder type than Dr. Smith, to whom, notwithstanding, such Churchmen as we have mentioned, dignified in position, and yet more dignified by learning and ability, for the most part very strong in their antipathy to dissent, felt it due to pay not only courtesy, but the meed of scholarly recognition and friendly intercourse.

After Dr. Smith succeeded, in 1807, to the divinity chair at Homerton, he was no longer called upon systematically to pursue classical studies; nor is it to be supposed that the leisure of so thorough a theologian, so assiduous a tutor, and so busy a public man, would be sufficient to allow him to do so. Yet we find so competent a judge as Dr. William Smith, well known as the author of the "Classical Dictionary," and the "Roman Atiquities," and who, during the last years of Dr. Pye Smith's residence at Homerton, was his colleague at the college as classical tutor, bearing strong testimony to the extent and accuracy of his classical learning. Dr. Pye Smith's contributions to the *Eclectic Review* ranged over a wide field of subjects—theology, Biblical criticism, classics, science, and sometimes the history and conflicts of contemporary evangelical Protestanism on the continent of Europe—almost everything, in fact, but poetry, the *belles-lettres*, and mathematics. It is rarely that the same man combines the accomplishments of the divine and of the classical scholar with the attainments of the man of science. The present age has certainly seen no union of qualifications so generally found apart, which deserves to be put in comparison with the case of Dr. Smith, if we except the great instance of Bishop Horsley. He was not a smatterer in these various departments: while in the two former he was a master, he was in the third an accomplished scholar and amateur. An original discoverer in science he could not be expected to be—but he was an original observer, and had taken pains to obtain a practical as well as theoretical acquaintance with the subject. From his youth, as we have seen, he had paid great attention to chemistry, botany, mineralogy, and natural history; in his later years geology became his special study. Geology had by this time established its rightful claim to be counted among the sciences, its main principles had been demonstratively established, and the details of its departments were beginning to be clearly understood. It had become apparent that one grand system of strata, implying a set order of stratification, already approximately determined beyond the power of reasonable and enlightened scepticism, ranged and re-

appeared in frusta and in fragments, but still in regular series, over the whole earth, so that, though there might be contemporaneous and substitutionary strata, and though particular strata might sometimes be wanting in any given portion of the grand series, yet the order of succession was never reversed; the superior *here* was never found to change places *elsewhere* with what had been its inferior, or *vice versa;* but on the whole, an unvarying rule of succession and superposition was found to hold, not less orderly and more surely than that in which the different bales of woollen goods are ranged above each other, according to their kinds and qualities, in the best-regulated warehouse. It was proved, too, that the fossils embedded in these successive strata exemplified respectively a similar and correspondent order of succession; and further, that the terrestrial and atmospheric conditions implied by the successive strata agreed precisely, so far as they could be ascertained, with the conditions which must have been necessary for the sustenance in life and well-being of their peculiar fossils. Dr. Smith, therefore, could no longer hesitate to give to this new science of geology a distinguished place among his studies. The long-hidden and deeply-buried antiquities which it brings to light, the successive acts of creation which it lays open to the student's sight, the remarkable manner in which it multiplies the evidences belonging to natural theology, opens to our inspection the natural history, so to speak, of many successive worlds, and shows us the foot-prints of creative power in its glorious and leisurely march through untold millenniums from past eternity till now: such reasons as these could not but commend this noble science to the attention of this truth-loving, God-inquiring man. But he had, besides, a special reason for undertaking its study. There was an apparent discrepancy between the teachings of geology and the cosmogony of Moses. Assuming this apparent to be a real discrepancy, very many good and able men refused to look at the proper evidence of geology, and pronounced the science to be one which could not be consistently believed in but by infidels. On the other hand, free-thinkers of all grades, founding on the same hypothesis, rejoiced in geology as having given the lie to Moses, and broken down the authority of the Bible. But Dr. Pye Smith could neither deny the claims of geology nor give up his Bible. He saw that ultimately the evidence of revealed truth itself must depend upon appeals to reason and matter of fact, not essentially different in kind from those upon which geology rests its claim to be accepted as a science. He was convinced that the claims of the human science were demonstrable on the same principles as those of the sacred book. He

accepted the obvious truths and discoveries of geology as being no less truly, though in a different and inferior sense, revelations of the divine mind and character, than the sayings of the Bible. He felt bound to study, reverence, and believe in God as revealed in his works, no less than in his word. He knew that between different parts of the divine word itself, there had seemed to be discrepancies as plain and direct as those assumed to exist between Genesis and the principles of geology. But patience and research had cleared up many of these. Others yet remained to be cleared up; still what Christian would think of impugning or denying the authority of either of the portions which appear to contradict each other? The true interpretation, when found, may show that there is no real contradiction, nor even a material difference. Or even if *one* of the places should be demonstrably incorrect, still the text may be impaired, or the passage itself may be a gloss. Now Dr. Smith held that likewise God's word and God's works are twin revelations, one of which may be compared with the other, but which cannot really come into collision with each other. If the sense of the one seems to differ from what is most certainly and demonstrably the teaching of the other, we must assume that we have not deduced the right sense; our interpretation is at fault, and must be revised. Acting on these principles, and convinced that the doctrine of the book of Genesis *could not* really oppose such main principles of geology as were, in his opinion, made as indubitably sure as the first truths of astronomy or the axioms of physical science, Dr. Pye Smith set himself to the task of reconciling the one record with the other. He felt that, if he could succeed in this, he should wrest a deadly weapon out of the hand of infidelity; that he might hope to save thousands of young people whom the boasts of freethinkers and the anathemas of Christian teachers were uniting to alienate from the religion of the Bible; and that he should add a new and delightful region to the domains from which the Bible claims homage and tribute to the grand truths upon which its special revelations are based, and which in many places it so expressly and impressively teaches. The result of Dr. Pye Smith's labours in this department was his lectures on *Scripture and Geology.* We do not bind ourselves to every canon laid down, and to every view expounded in this able volume; but we are convinced that it did excellent service to the cause both of science and of sacred truth. That its science was good has been admitted by the most competent authorities; and the reputation of Dr. Smith for spiritual piety and strict orthodoxy silenced the objections, if it did not always still the doubts of evangelical believers. No other man could have done

the service at that time which Dr. Smith accomplished. Since then, in Great Britain, geology and Scripture have been very generally acknowledged not to be irreconcilably opposed to each other. We think it clear that the interpretation of Genesis, which was formerly generally accepted, but which has, ever since the Christian era, been from time to time questioned by expositors of high ability, may have been determined, unconsciously, by established, but erroneous views of cosmogony, by foregone conclusions derived from a now exploded science and philosophy.

We need not dwell upon Dr. Smith's character as a controversialist. His great work, the *Scripture Testimony*, appears to us to contain a perfect argument. How poor is Hengstenberg's Christology compared to this! It is throughout a work of solid, wrought gold. It is a chain, every link of which is perfect. Nor is there any waste in it, either of argument, or learning, or words. All is there that could be desired, but condensed with most conscientious care. The work is concinnate as well as complete. And then the spirit, how tender, how Christian! Nothing finer can be imagined. How cautious and candid is the argument! how careful is the author as to the authority of every text he cites! how anxious on no account to overthrow a single point! There can be no doubt that *Pye Smith's* work alone has done more to stem and turn back the tide of Socinianism which was some years ago setting in on both sides of the Atlantic than all other works put together. Belshamite Unitarianism it fairly put to the rout, to be succeeded by Channingism, and then by the vague and dogmatic spiritualism of these later times. *This* must be met by other weapons. Some Unitarians have gratefully acknowledged this book to have been the means of bringing them to a saving faith in Christ, as unbelievers of another stamp have confessed their obligations for the same result to Dr. Smith's *Scripture and Geology.* We need not here add anything to what we have before said of that excellent supplement to the "Scripture Testimony," the *Four Discourses on the Sacrifice and Priesthood of Christ.*

As a theologian, Dr. Smith belonged to the old dogmatic school. His methods were, we might say, mathematical; propositions, lemmas, corollaries, figure largely in the pages of his *First Lines of Theology.* Something of the same is also seen in his *Four Discourses.* He had a strong predilection for logic and metaphysics. He often uses *à priori* arguments, and will draw out his logical chain of inferences to a great length, without any misgiving as to the security of each several link. He was well read in the scholastic divines; had caught the spirit, in some degree, of their deductive

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

method; and in the thirteenth century might have divided the theological empire with Aquinas. He was a logical and metaphysical Necessitarian, and a strict disciple of Jonathan Edwards, but in exegesis a Calvinist of the moderate school. He firmly maintained that it was the apostolic practice, and (by an absolute *ergo*, on the principles of Independent Church polity,) the duty of all Christian pastors and Churches, to celebrate the Lord's supper each Lord's day. For many years he enforced this practice in his own Church, till, finding he was often left alone to the service, he at length was compelled to conform to the usual rule of administering it once a month. He kept up the practice, however, in private, to the last. Perhaps, if Dr. Smith had gone back to the practice of the earliest and most illustrious apostolic Church, that at Jerusalem, he would have been convinced that they "broke bread" in the Lord's supper *daily*. Would he then have felt himself bound to administer daily? The sacrament of baptism he refused to administer unless one at least of the parents was a member of the Church, in this point agreeing rather with Scottish Independents and Presbyterians than with English Nonconformists. His views, as to the obligation of the Sabbath, were peculiar and rather unsettled. We think that they were at all times not very consistent, although, substantially, we have no doubt he was right. And it is delightful to find that while Dr. Smith had his own way of stating and arguing what he felt to be the obligation of keeping holy the Lord's day, he had no laxity of feeling or of conscience in regard to the obligation itself and the manner in which it should be kept. Mrs. Pye Smith, his second wife, who survives her husband, says:—

> "Every one knows that a strictly conscientious regard to the sanctity of the Lord's day, formed a prominent habit in the personal and domestic life of the doctor; but all are not aware of the sacrifices he made in order to attain this sacred object. Regularly, invitations were sent to him, as F. R. S., to attend the soirées of the president of the Royal Society. To these the current of taste and of inclination would have carried him; but a higher impulse he was bound to obey. These brilliant assemblies were invariably arranged to take place on Saturday evenings."

The doctor *never went*, because he would not even approach to anything like an infringement of the sanctity of the Lord's day. To him this was indeed the *Lord's day*—the name by which he loved to call it; it was eminently "a delight, holy of the Lord, and honourable," a day of congenial meditation and enjoyment, of holy rest and worship. He systematically abstained from all engagements which would have required him to travel on that day; and he addressed a beautiful letter to his private friend Dr. Cardwell, already named, Clerk of the Closet to Her Britannic

Majesty, requesting him to lay before the queen a respectful and loyal representation of the feeling of the Christians of the country in regard to the Sunday performances of the band at Windsor.

Because Dr. Smith was a divine and a theological tutor, he did not, on that account. think himself compelled to abstain from the exercise of his rights as a citizen. On the contrary, he was a keen, though a truly Christian politician. His politics, our readers are aware, were in his youth sufficiently low, perhaps we must say extreme. Experience modified some of his views, but never changed their general bias and character. He was, to the end of his days, a Whig-Radical. Having property of his own in Yorkshire; and having, also, a vote for the county of Middlesex; being, moreover, for many years, trustee for landed property lying in two other counties, he had four county votes at his disposal. These he always went to give, at whatever cost or inconvenience, and would never receive a farthing toward his expenses. On one occasion he even addressed the electors from the hustings in support of Mr. Hume. He also felt it to be a duty to attend and speak at the anti-Corn Law League, at Manchester. And in 1849 he went, spite of the remonstrances of his friends, to take part in the Peace-Congress at Paris. We could not, in these things, have done *just* as Dr. Smith did, on any side; but we do not presume to condemn his principles or proceedings.

As a preacher, Pye Smith, in early life, was, we may say, even popular. This, however, was not the case during the greater part of his career. His voice was weak; his style, though excellent, was rather suited to the theological lecture in a college than to a pulpit address; his matter was convincing and expository, but he never attempted declamation or impassioned appeal. In fine, his discourses lacked fire and force, and he was destitute of all rhetorical accessories and recommendations. As a teacher he was most fatherly and faithful, vigilant in sympathetic care and concern, and accustomed regularly to hold private conversations with the students. Of his diligence and ability as a teacher we need not speak. His lectures, except those on ecclesiastical history, were delivered extempore from such outlines as are now published in the *First Lines*. Of late years, the lecturer, wearying of his reiterated round, was apt to be too irregular and discursive. Till after the death of his first wife, both the students and his friends were excluded from his society in private; but from that time forward this was entirely reversed. The students had access to him at all times, and were often invited to his house; while his noble library was ever open to them. From this time, too, he delighted to keep up intercourse, both in private and

by letter, with his numerous and ever-multiplying friends. He was largely generous and benevolent, giving away, it would seem, on an average, about one-fifth of his income. At the same time he enriched his library with every new work of merit, theological, classical, and scientific, which appeared in English, German, or French. He had a fine collection of atlases and philosophical instruments. He was an exemplary husband and a most tender father, and his children repaid his love with due affection and reverence. Of *very intimate* friends he had few; though he had so many valuable acquaintances and correspondents. To all persons he was particularly courteous and accessible, and especially painstaking and kind in replying to letters from strangers asking information or a solution of difficulties. The amount of time he gave away to such applicants must have been enormous. The great social disability of his life was deafness, which, during his latter years, almost disqualified him for pastoral visitation and for miscellaneous society.

Dr. Smith, we remark in conclusion, was a Christian of the very highest style. His faith was as firm as it was intelligent; and his spirit was as devout and prayerful as his understanding was strong and well-furnished. He was much with God in private. He sanctified all his undertakings by "the word of God and prayer." This was his solace in a most painful and protracted fight of domestic temptation and affliction; this enabled him to conduct many controversies in an unvarying spirit of Christian gentleness and candour; this preserved his soul from wavering in its fundamental Christian faith, or losing the fervour of its love, while he was weighing with nicest accuracy all arguments that were hostile to the doctrines of the Bible and of the cross; this gave him, in one word, a meekness, serenity, and hope which seem to have been scarcely ever interrupted. Let none venture on such perilous work as he was called upon to undertake without seeking first, and from first to last, a baptism of the same Spirit. So we bid farewell to the memory of the greatest master in theology that English Nonconformity has produced since the close of the seventeenth century.

ART. IV.—THE RELATIONS OF ROMANISM AND PROTESTANTISM TO CIVILIZATION.

Les Nations Catholiques et les Nations Protestantes comparées sous le triple rapport du bien-être, des lumières et de la moralité. Par NAPOLEON ROUSSEL. 2 vols. Paris, 1855.

WHAT would have been thought presumption a century ago—what, in fact, was punished with imprisonment in the Bastile—is now a sober truth, a subject for free and open discussion: of Protestantism and Popery, which system has the best claims to the gratitude of society? Does modern civilization spring from the decretals? or is the Bible the safeguard of our institutions, our happiness, our prosperity both material and intellectual? When Voltaire published his *Lettres sur les Anglais*, he may be said to have both stated the problem and partly solved it; this is why we alluded just now to the "durance vile" which, under the *ancien régime*, acted as a check upon those who dreamed of reforms in Church and State. We are thankful to say that in some degree, at least, writers now may speak out their thoughts; and although the French press is still too closely under surveillance, we find no law in the *code pénal* preventing us from asserting and proving that popery is "the mystery of iniquity." Accordingly, pastor Roussel, well known on both sides of the Atlantic as a smart controversialist, and as a faithful minister of the gospel, has taken up the pen, and now comes before us with a couple of volumes, which we cannot better describe than by saying that they contain the key to the political history of the world in which we live.

Some persons, whose anxiety for the imperishable cause of truth borders almost upon pusillanimity, have felt very much alarmed at the Ultramontane reaction which still keeps disturbing the various ranks of society. That the followers of Jesus are about to pass through some severe ordeal is extremely probable; but can we entertain a doubt as to the issue of the conflict? If the Jesuit party are now straining every nerve, and drawing upon all their resources, it is because they feel that their position is a desperate one; they rush on madly to the last contest with the terrible cry ringing in their ears, "*Roma ruit!*"

M. Roussel is not the only author who has lately pronounced the funeral oration of the Roman Catholic nations; more than one observer has noticed the gradual but sure decay of those political

communities who claim a Latin extraction; the difference, however, between M. Roussel and his brethren of the quill is a great one: he points to the spread of gospel principles as the only safeguard of civilization; while MM. Quinet, de Tocqueville, and Kératry, either just lay the evil bare, or propose some useless remedy, if they propose one at all.

The book we are now considering makes no pretensions to originality. Instead of broaching some new scheme, or launching forth into declamation, M. Roussel prefers the sober but safe plan of dealing with facts. He institutes a parallel between the various nations which cover the face of the globe, and supported by a host of unexceptionable authorities, he proves most satisfactorily that under the three-fold aspect of physical comfort, intellectual culture and moral development, the Protestant communities have decidedly the advantage. Let us make a few extracts.

We are first introduced to a general view of the subject;* it is a kind of statistical survey, enabling the author to arrange under the two following groups the various nations he proposes examining:—

Catholic group.	Protestant group.
South America,	North America,
Ireland,	Scotland,
The Catholic Cantons of Switzerland,	The Protestant Cantons of Switzerland,
Austria,	Prussia,
Belgium,	Holland,
Spain.	England.

Mr. Roussel's way of discussing his data may be thought sometimes fanciful. When he compares Belgium with Holland, for instance, or Austria with Prussia, we can see at once geographical and political reasons which justify such a parallel; but we must confess that we do not perceive so clearly that England, more than any other country, should have been selected as a term of comparison with Spain. In the above series we find neither France nor Italy; M. Roussel has devoted a separate chapter to each of those nations. Italy is Roman Catholicism on the throne; and France, Protestantism on the cross:—Roman Catholicism on the throne with debased, degraded, depraved subjects, whom either fear or superstition has brought under a dotard's rule; Protestantism on the cross, while a population of infidels, who keep oscillating between Voltaire and Louis Blanc, are endeavouring, at the bidding of the Jesuits, to stop the progress of the gospel, and to revive the good old times of Louis XIV.

On the subject of intellectual development, M. Roussel has collected a variety of curious details, compiled from the works of M.

---

* Roussel, vol. i, *Vue d'ensemble*, p. 8, seq.

M. Schnitzter,* and Moreau de Jonnès.† First of all, we are naturally led to consider the state of primary instruction. Mr. Schnitzter gives us the following summary :—In Saxony, there is one pupil for every six inhabitants; the Netherlands, six; Prussia, six and one-sixth; Great Britain, (England and Wales,) eight; Belgium, nine; Austria, ten and a half; France, eleven. The first four nations are Protestant, the last three are Catholic. If we take the two averages we have :—One pupil for six and a-half Protestants; one pupil for ten Catholics; or, to state the fact in other language, the Protestants who know how to read and write, are to the Catholics in the same ratio as twenty to thirteen. Does Mr. de Jonnès confirm or refute Mr. Schnitzter? We shall judge. His statement gives:—

Great Britain,........................	1 pupil for every	6	inhabitants in	1833
Switzerland, (Canton of Vaud,)	do.	6	do.	1828
Baden,................................	do.	7	do.	1825
Bavaria,................................	do.	7	do.	1825
Wurtemberg,........................	do.	8	do.	1827
Netherlands,........................	do.	10	do.	1826
Prussia,................................	do.	10	do.	1825
Austria,................................	do.	16	do.	1822
France,................................	do.	17	do.	1834
Denmark,................................	do.	30	do.	1825
Kingdom of Naples,................	do.	45	do.	1818
Kingdom of Poland,................	do.	100	do.	1823
Portugal,................................	do.	109	do.	1819
Hungary,................................	do.	350	do.	1835
Spain,................................	do.	350	do.	1803

A glance at this list will show that with one exception, on both sides, the first half is Protestant, while the second is Catholic. We can even account for the anomaly respecting Bavaria, by remarking that this Roman Catholic nation, placed in the middle of Protestant communities, must have received the light shining upon it from all quarters, and followed the general impulse. But let us seek a more exact measure, by placing Bavaria among the Catholic nations, and Denmark among the Protestant; if, instead of computing the whole communities, we now reckon individuals, we shall have as an average, one pupil for every one hundred and twenty-four Catholics, and one for every ten Protestants. In order to be still nearer the truth, we reduce the Catholic ratio to one per one hundred, on account of the somewhat old dates affixed to a few of the countries which concur in making up that average; we shall even then obtain the astonish-

---

* *Statistique générale, méthodique et complète de la France*, 4 vols., 8vo.

† *Statistique de la Grande Bretagne et de l' Irlande*, 2 vols., 8vo.

ing result—ten times more pupils in the whole Protestant nations put together than in the Catholic ones.

M. Roussel very properly remarks that school statistics throw no light upon the intellectual state of the higher classes; a government may find its interest in encouraging the diffusion of elementary knowledge, and at the same time in preventing the spread of every other species of instruction; therefore if we desire to secure a correct view of the intellectual progress of a nation, we must rise above the details of primary education. The census of newspaper readers is a tolerably good test of the degree of intellectual culture in a community; for the great majority derives all its information from the periodical press, and most persons whose occupations make it impossible for them to devote any considerable portion of time to a regular course of mental training, are thankful to find historical or scientific information ready digested for them in the pages of the magazine or review. M. Roussel's calculations lead him to a conclusion which confirms his previous statement respecting schools. The number of copies of periodical publications circulated among the Protestants compared with those which we find in Roman Catholic districts is as nine to one; now we have already ascertained that the correct ratio for the scholars is as ten to one; so we are led to conclude that education generally bears its fruits, and that ten pupils produce nine readers.

These facts, so plainly told and so clearly deduced from documents which it is impossible to question, naturally suggest a few reflections; and we make no apology for laying them before our readers. The power of the periodical press in the present age cannot be overrated. This is a truth which may be deplored by some and looked upon as the abomination of desolation; but it is a truth, and we must make the best of it. Three centuries ago Roman Catholicism would have sent a recusant printer to the dungeons of the Inquisition, and would have held over an unfortunate editor's head, as a kind of sword of Damocles, the law *de hæretico comburendo.* Such coercive measures, however, are impossible now; and so the pope himself, finding it useless to attempt to sweep away the press entirely, endeavours to prove, through the mouth of Cardinal Wiseman, that the Church alone (i. e., the Church of Rome) can correct the abuses and reform the licentiousness of periodical literature. The only thing which astonishes us in his reverence's lecture, is that in the course of his allusion to the low state of popular publications in France, he does not frankly acknowledge how much the system of popery has contributed to bring about such a state of things. "*Me, me, adsum qui feci,*" should have been the cardinal's deeply-felt

exclamation. But no, he does not confess that the storm he purposes to quell is of his own raising; people, he feels confident, will not be easily led to believe that he who has accumulated the filth in the Augean stables is the best qualified to clear it off again.

We have selected France as the fittest example in this case, for a very obvious reason. In that country public opinion has always had extraordinary power. Under Voltaire's reign, "the brethren of the quill" ruled the destinies of Europe. Who was Frederick the Second's tutor? Who advised the empress Catherine, and governed even the pope? Who but those *philosophers*, now-a-days represented by MM. Michelet, Eugene Sue, Quinet? This assertion is so fully borne out by fact, that nobody, we feel confident, will deny it. But another point seems to us quite as incontrovertible, namely, that at the time when the spirit of infidelity spread over the length and breadth of the kingdom, there was no other individual or set of individuals, except the Romish Church, that had the right of propounding opinions on matters of religious, political, or social interest. No; heresy had been effectually suppressed, and the voice of truth no longer sounded, either in the fastnesses of the Cevennes, or behind the walls of Port Royal. Such being the case it cannot be said that Voltaire and his friends, the *encyclopædists*, had learned deism at the *prêches* of Cherenton; it was not a Calvinist minister who dictated to Diderot his obscene tales; it was not the pastor of one of the Churches in the wilderness who infected Crébillon and d'Alembert. Alas! priests, *abbés*, bishops, princes of the Church, encouraged Voltaire to "crush the wretch;" an *abbé* wrote the "*Histoire Philosophique des deux Indes;*" an *abbé* wrote "Manon Lescaut;" an *abbé* reduced metaphysics to sensualism; an *abbé* was the Duke d'Orléans' prime minister and the chief associate of all his debaucheries. It is no paradox to affirm that the saturnalia of the Reign of Terror sprang from the Vatican itself, and that we are indebted to the pope for the cap of "Red Republicanism."

The reign of Napoleon, in restoring French society to something like order and outward decency, did not bring back at once the blessings of true religion; it requires more than a few years to destroy the effects produced by such an outpouring of infidelity as that which took place in the last century. As a matter of course, it follows that when constitutional governments and comparative liberty of the press became, in 1815, the order of the day, instead of publicists, legislators and orators ready to maintain from the gospel standpoint the true principles of liberty, France exhibited the spectacle

of an Ultramontane minority struggling for power against an opposition made up of Voltairians, Utilitarians, Socialists, neo-Christians, Saint Simonians, etc., etc. The absence of right principles soon tells upon the state of popular literature; during the lapse of time comprised between 1815 and 1848 the periodical press in France has constantly been sinking lower and lower until we have seen it—and rather rejoiced at the sight—almost swept away under the stringent decrees of the present imperial government. And no wonder it should be so when we find Eugene Sue worshipped as a demi-god, and rational beings taking their cue from George Sand.

We do not blame Cardinal Wiseman for pointing out the necessity of reforming the cheap literature of the day; all that we maintain is, that the party he represents is not capable of carrying out that reform. What will they substitute instead? What intellectual food have they to offer to the new generation? The works of Alphonso Ligorio, extracts from the Bollandists, or pseudo-historical treatises in which the truth is sacrificed to the interests of Jesuitism. With such trash set before them, it would be somewhat astonishing if a nation still ignorant of gospel truths did not rush to the other extreme and adopt thoroughly infidel principles. There is no doubt that news-venders and cheap booksellers, both in England and in America, are supplying daily cart-loads of garbage to the mechanics and labourers of our large towns; but then, on the other hand, the antidote circulates quite as freely by the care of Bible and tract societies; and we feel convinced that the influence and spread of evangelical religion alone have preserved the nations of Anglo-Saxon origin from those revolutionary upheavings which seem likely to end in the absolute dissolution of the political societies belonging to the great Latin family.

The question of morality is closely connected with that of intellectual development. Every one has heard of M. de Bonald's celebrated axiom, that literature is the expression of society; we believe this is quite true, and certainly, judging matters from that standpoint, we must acknowledge with M. Roussel that Roman Catholicism is not more favourable to morality than to mental culture.

"Our moral corruption manifests itself under two principal aspects: violent crimes and shameful vices, assassinations and loose morals. One word on each of these two points. Many causes influence the judges in their decisions; therefore we shall reckon not only crimes actually perpetrated, but those which have been merely attempted. The first class alone give the measure of the severity of human laws; combined with the second, they show better the perversity of man. M. de Jonnès then brings before us the following results:—

MURDERS AND ATTEMPTS TO MURDER IN EUROPE.

Scotland,	1835	1 for every	270,000
England		"	178,000
The Netherlands,	1824	"	163,000
Prussia,	1826	"	100,000
Austria,	1809	"	57,000
Spain,	1826	"	4,113
Naples		"	2,750
States of the Church		"	750

> "In this gradually decreasing scale of morality, the first four states are Protestant, the last four Catholic. In order to get a more correct measure, let us take the average, and we have for the whole of the above-named Protestant nations one murder or attempt to murder for every 180,222; while in the Catholic countries we find one murder or attempt to murder for every 16, 153. In other terms, the ratio of crimes among the Roman Catholics, compared with Protestants, is eleven to one.
>
> "We now go on to the second point, to morals, properly so called, which we appreciate by their deficiency, not by their perfection. We acknowledge that illegitimate births are not a very sure test of the immorality of a nation: in one country legal marriages are attended by so many difficulties that the sanction of the law is not generally sought; elsewhere public opinion admits that a wife may countenance a lover's addresses without any disparagement to her husband, thus legalizing immorality and transforming impurity into adulterous intercourse; prostitution, in a third instance, effaces the origin of illegitimate unions. These three cases offer remedies far worse than the evil. But as we do not pretend to supply our readers with perfectly exact appreciations in subjects of this description, we shall merely quote from the data furnished by statistical accounts."—Vol. i, pp. 18-20.

M. Roussel then takes an average from a series of numbers, as he has done already in the case of violent crimes, and he finds that there are twice as many natural children born among Roman Catholic communities as in Protestant nations. One fact, to which we shall now allude, very easily accounts for the great excess of crime and the uncommon laxity of morals noticeable wherever the religion of the pope reigns supreme:—

> "When crimes can be compounded for, a criminal is seldom deterred from committing them. The Italian robber, the Spanish prostitute, satisfy the claims of conscience by dividing their profits with the Virgin Mary. We find in history that more than one murderer has taken the holy communion as a preparation for the crime he was about to perpetrate. Something similar occurs in the case of suicides. M. de Guerry gives us a long list of instances in which that crime has been committed under the safeguard of the Roman Catholic religion. Sometimes it is a man who hangs himself in asking God's pardon; or a woman, on the point of taking poison, begs that masses may be said for the good of her soul. On other occasions, the self-murderer has provided himself with amulets and small prints which reveal the state of his thoughts. The greater number ground their hopes of heaven on the fact that they have suffered here below; they present as an expiatory offering the apparent sacrifice of their life, in conformity with the Roman Catholic doctrine, that he who suffers may offer his troubles as a pleasing oblation to God. But the learned statistician must speak for himself:—'Many persons will, no doubt,

be astonished at this manifestation of religious feelings, at the very moment when the individual who expresses them is on the point of committing a deed which religion condemns as a crime. Yet similar discrepancies are more common than one might suppose. Several suicides cross themselves before hurrying into eternity; others kneel down and say their prayers; on a few are to be found rosaries and devotional books.'

"Can *one* case be quoted in which a Protestant has justified from the Bible an attempt on his own life?"—Vol. ii, pp. 368, 369.

The low state of morality which renders Catholic nations so unfortunately conspicuous must, in due time, tell upon the whole life, both political and intellectual, of the people. We have seen, with M. Roussel, that the popish misrepresentation of the great doctrine of atonement necessarily encourages crime. When an error such as this is adopted by a nation gifted with a highly imaginative and poetic temperament, we can state at once what direction it will give to literature. We shall have the novelist and the dramatic writer selecting for the leading idea of their compositions the glaring paradox that love, as a cleansing baptism, washes away all the stains of the most polluted life. We shall have characters borrowed from the annals of the jail, and novelists finding fault with Protestant ladies, because, though "they may be chaste, pure, virtuous, *yet their unexpansive love is always calm and orderly, as proceeding from a consciousness of fulfilled duty.*"

Time will not allow us to follow M. Roussel through every successive chapter of his interesting work; we can only add, that he has brought together with great industry and care all the data necessary to help the reader in the solution of that important problem, What are the destinies of Protestantism—what are those of Roman Catholicism? Is it God, who, after all, must reign supreme over the conscience of man, or is it the priest?

But there is one point which we feel the need of insisting upon still further, in connexion with our subject, viz., that the different elements which compose true civilization are closely linked together, and are never found apart from one another. Wherever true religion is, there you may depend upon meeting political freedom, physical comfort, all the blessings of industry in the various branches of commerce and agriculture, together with a high state of intellectual development.

What are the laws which bind the moral universe? Knowledge and virtue. The sum of all knowledge is acquaintance with God and his works; and the sum of all virtue, because of all the commandments, is love to God and our neighbour. And as from these all good springs, it follows that whatever country has most of them must be most prosperous, exalted and happy. Now, will any per-

son deny that the great scheme carried on by the Roman Catholic priesthood has been precisely the reverse of the principles we have just now stated? We say with M. Roussel, Look at Ireland as compared with Scotland, look at the United States compared with South America, look at Belgium compared with Holland. We would point more especially to Ireland, because that unfortunate country has been used *ad nauseam* as an argument against Protestant principles and Protestant administration. It is all very well to talk about British misrule; but after having made every allowance for the evil consequences which arise from the juxtaposition on the same soil of the conquerors and the conquered, with all the difference in manners, habits, feelings, which separate the Celtic from the Saxon race,—after all this is freely admitted, we must maintain that the time and attention bestowed since 1800 on Irish affairs by the legislature of Great Britain has more than atoned for any anterior mismanagement or act of oppression. During the last fifty-four years, thirty-three committees of parliament, and twenty-one government commissions have been appointed to inquire into the causes of Ireland's miseries and the best means of their removal; and during the same period the Irish have received £26,000,000 sterling in mere grants and advances;* £1,000,000 have been given to construct harbours for commerce, £8,500,000 to encourage manufactures, £8,000,000 to save the people from the grave of famine; while canals, railways, agriculture, and fisheries, have all been nursed at the public expense. Nay, even Irish charitable institutions are largely supported by parliamentary grants.† Yet, while not a tithe of this kindness has been shown to Scotland, the agitator has for years harped upon British neglect.

Since the events which have marked the year 1848, Roman Catholic writers have taken up another argument against Protestantism, and they have selected it with the tact and dexterity they so generally evidence in their controversial discussions. Socialism is represented by M. Nicolas‡ as the legitimate offspring of Protestant doctrines, and the close relation which exists betweeen Luther and M. Proudhon is now proved to a demonstration. In answer to this calumny, we might point again to Ireland. What have the priests done there, but to spread the spirit of disaffection and rebellion? The fact is, that Romanism can fawn before *le peuple souverain* or bless the iron rule of despots, according to circumstances, and as it seems best to suit its own purposes. No one will credit Dr. Cahill if he tells us that the only object he has for exciting the

---

* Thorn's Statistics, *passim*.

† Ibid., p. 251.

‡ *Du Protestantisme et de toutes les hérésies dans leurs rapports avec le Socialisme.*

Irish to agitation is the love of popular freedom. No; what he dreads, what all the Romish hierarchy dreads, is that that very spirit of liberty should spread far and wide, and put an end to their own influence. They are full well aware that as soon as the Irishman gets beyond the reach of the father confessor, it is not long before he flings off all his allegiance to a religion he never really loved. "Those priests," says an English writer,* "who, during the revolution of 1848, with a subtlety altogether worthy of them, appeared foremost in the republican ranks, and were the noisiest of the crowds who shouted 'liberty, equality, fraternity,' were *all the while* quietly waiting the turn of the tide; and so are *now* the avowed leaders of that dreadful conspiracy which is formed against the freedom of Europe."

Really it is too bad of M. Nicolas to speak disparagingly of Socialism, when he can, without much trouble, find in the very ranks of the communion he extols so many agitators, quasi-reformists, and orators, who have endeavoured to bring about an *entente cordiale* between the tenets of Robespierre and the vagaries of the infallible Church.

The fact is, that Roman Catholicism may be compared to a huge body which, nearly overcome by disease, and gasping under the last agonies of death, rallies itself for a while and makes one last and desperate struggle, in which it spends all its energy. In conclusion of M. Roussel's book, our own conclusion is that Romanism has lived its day, and that it is now passing away. The ship which carries the successor of St. Peter and his fortunes appears now only like a crazy barque conveying to certain destruction those infatuated nations who would trust to it for safety. "If we measure," says a celebrated French writer, "the respective progress made since 1814 by Catholic and non-Catholic nations, we must be utterly astounded at the disproportion. England and the United States, both Protestant communities, have assumed on an extraordinary scale the dominion over immense regions already numerously populated, but destined to be still more so at some later period. England is now carrying on the conquest of those vast and thickly inhabited provinces known by the name of India. In America, the same kingdom has spread civilization through the north districts, in the deserts of Upper Canada. The industry of her children has also secured for Great Britain an island, Australia, which is a real continent, and its offshoots may be found in the chief groups with which the ocean is studded. Not only have the United States increased in population and wealth throughout their original territory, they

---

* Rev. Dr. Dill. *Ireland's Miseries*, &c.

have extended that territory to its utmost limits, and are now bounded on each side by the ocean. San Francisco is another New-York, whose influence will most likely be within a very short space of time quite equal to that of the former great city. The states have made trial of their superiority upon the Catholic nations of the new world, and reduced them to acknowledge a rule which no one now ever calls in question. After the first attempt made by England against China, both that nation and the United States seem destined to submit to their rule the two most renowned empires in the east, China and Japan. In the meanwhile let us see the progress accomplished during the same space of time by the Roman Catholic communities. The first of all, the most compact, the most renowned, France, which fifty years ago appeared at the head of modern civilization, has seen her sceptre broken and her power dispersed amid the most unheard-of disasters. With the noblest courage, with the most unconquerable energy, she has risen from her ruins; but whenever the observer might have thought that she was about to take her flight anew, fate has sent to her, as a scourge from God, some revolution to paralyze her efforts, and to bring her once more to the ground. The balance of power between Catholic and non-Catholic civilization has evidently been displaced since 1789."*

We shall subjoin only one word of comment to this eloquent quotation. M. Michel Chevallier, who wrote it originally, and M. Roussel, who reproduces it, are both Frenchmen, and so appear to be pronouncing the funeral oration of their own country. But it is not so; true patriotism is not inconsistent with evangelical Christianity. France may still, by breaking off the fetters which bind her to Rome, retrieve her former place in the sphere of civilization; and after a serious consideration of the plain truths so industriously put together by M. Roussel, who would hesitate for a moment to pronounce on which side—Protestantism or Catholicism—are to be found the best guarantees toward the permanent happiness of the great human family?

---

* *Journal des Debats. September*, 1853.

ART. V.—WERE THE TEN TRIBES OF ISRAEL EVER LOST?

THE question which we have placed at the head of this article, ought, first of all, to have been answered before any attempt had been made to find the Ten Tribes. The exact point to which we shall direct our inquiry is this, namely:—Were the Ten Tribes of Israel *ever lost* in any sense differing materially from that in which Judah was lost? If not, is there proof that Israel and Judah returned to their own country, together, at the close of the "seventy years'" captivity in Babylon? If an affirmative answer to the last question can be given, by a reasonable exegesis of the Scriptures which afford testimony upon this point, and that testimony evolved by no other rules of interpretation than such as will commend themselves to the common sense of men, then all the theories, whether to account for the loss of the Ten Tribes from history, or their recovery to the general recognizance of the Church, which are built upon the assumption that they *are* lost, must of necessity go for nothing; as also will many cognate notions respecting the Jews. We shall endeavour in the following pages to show that the Ten Tribes of Israel have been recovered from their *eastern dispersion*, and that their subsequent history is identical with that of Judah and Benjamin, both in the Bible and in the general history of society so far as it sketches the life and fortunes of the "chosen people."

In order to a full understanding of what will hereafter be said in proof of this point, we must briefly recall the facts belonging to the history of the captivity; for as both Israel and Judah were carried away in parts, at different times and to different places, it is possible that embarrassment will arise when we come to certain prophecies which speak of their recovery, seeing that the theatre for the fulfilment of these predictions is the country of Babylon. A careful consideration of the following facts will remove all appearance of difficulty in the exposition of this subject, so far, at least, as it relates to the dispersion. The leading facts of the dispersion of Israel are given in the following passages. In 1 Chron. v, 26, it is said:—"And the God of Israel stirred up the spirit of Pul, King of Assyria, and the spirit of Tilgath-pilneser, King of Assyria, and he carried them away, even the Reubenites, and the Gadites, and the half-tribe of Manasseh, and brought them unto Halah, and Habor, and Hara, and to the river Gozan, unto this day." For an account of the final overthrow of the kingdom of Israel, see 2 Kings xviii, 9–11. Shal-

maneser, after having besieged the capital for a period of three years, reduced it and carried "away Israel, and put them in Halah, and in Habor by the river of Gozan, and in the cities of the Medes."

Assyria and Media were, then, the places or countries to which the Ten Tribes were carried. Media at that time was a province of Assyria; but after the death of Sardanapalus, the son and successor of Pul, it was erected into an independent government. With the fall of Sardanapalus terminated the old Assyrian empire, after having subsisted for nearly one thousand five hundred years. Not far from the year B. C. 750, the fragments of this ancient government were reconstructed into three kingdoms, namely:—Babylon, Nineveh, and Media. The history of these three powers runs in parallel lines for about one hundred years, or to the year B. C. 670, when the Assyrians of Babylon and the Assyrians of Nineveh were united under Saosduchinus, the first Nebuchodonosor of the Holy Scriptures. The united kingdoms of Babylon and Nineveh having continued for about half a century were finally resolved into the kingdom of Babylon proper. In the meantime the sovereign power of Media became regal. Arbaces, who at the time of the breaking up of the old Assyrian empire was provincial governor of Media, (and in fact it was he who took the lead in the conspiracy which resulted in the overthrow of Sardanapalus, and the fall of his kingdom,) continued to exercise sovereign authority over the Medes without taking upon himself the title of king. Dejoces, however, did assume it, and caused himself to be declared king of the Medes. Let the reader bear it in mind that according to the explicit language of prophecy, (Jer. li, 11,) Media was to furnish, under God, the deliverance of his chosen people.

For an account of the fall of Judah, see 2 Kings, chapters xxiv and xxv. From the time when the kingdom of Israel was finally destroyed to the period when the house of Judah was carried away there elapsed a period of about one hundred and fifteen years. Jehoiachin fell about the year B. C. 606. At this date commences the seventy years' captivity. Judah was therefore carried to what we have called Babylon proper; for, as is apparent by the dates already given, Nineveh was now included in Babylon. We have been thus particular in placing before our readers these dates, and the political situation of the captive tribes, that they may the more easily understand why Babylon is made so conspicuous in those prophecies in which the deliverance of the Jews is foretold, and, also, that they may see that the indiscriminate decree of Cyrus terminating the captivity of the JEWS, for the reason that the *children of Israel and the children of Judah* were all of them under his

authority, did release the *twelve tribes of Jacob* from their bondage. They had been carried to Babylon, and Media, and, for anything shown to the contrary, they were in these two countries when the former was conquered by the latter. When the time came for their release from captivity *they were all included under one government*, namely, Media, and, immediately afterward, in Medo-Persia, by whose king the great commission of their release was executed. Media, then, could be excepted from the language of prophetic denunciation, as but a small portion of Israel was deported into that country. The largest portion of Israel and the whole of the house of Judah were captives in Babylon. The treasures and sacred vessels of the Lord's house were in Babylon. Those who had committed sacrilege and profaned the temple of the Most High were in Babylon; and here, too, were the lineal progenitors of the promised Messiah. Indeed, it had been declared in the language of prophecy, that those judgments which were to befall Babylon, and by which God's people were to be delivered, were "the vengeance of the Lord, the vengeance of his temple," (Jer. li, 11,) which is a very plain intimation that hereby God would vindicate the honour of his name and temple, which Babylon had despised. Moreover, this guilty land was to be the theatre upon which the Lord would work out the great purposes of his mercy in healing the house of Jacob, which had suffered by disruption at first, and then by hostilities and collisions, carried on mutually, for many generations.

We shall now proceed to cite some of the passages of Scripture which go to show, we think, conclusively, that the promised deliverance from Babylon relates, equally, both to Israel and Judah. We begin with Jer. l, 4, 5: "In those days, and in that time, saith the Lord, the children of Israel shall come, they and the children of Judah together, going and weeping: they shall go, and seek the Lord their God. They shall ask the way to Zion, with their faces thitherward, saying, Come and let us join ourselves to the Lord in a perpetual covenant that shall not be forgotten." A mere glance at this passage will show that it foretells a period when *the children of Israel* and *the children of Judah* should yield up their long-cherished animosity toward each other, and in feelings of mutual reciprocity, heightened, possibly, by corresponding sufferings, should propose perpetual amity, based upon united and solemn promises to serve their God in the spirit of their covenant relations to him. Undeniably, then, it is here predicted that *all* the tribes of Jacob shall be recovered and united. But it will be asked, *When* was this reunion to take place? This is an important question, and it is necessary to a cor-

rect and full understanding of this prophecy that a true answer be given to it. This we think can be done easily; for although the year of the world is not given in which this was to take place, yet circumstantial evidence is afforded by which the period of the fulfilment of this prediction is made as certain and satisfactory as if the date of the year had been given in arithmetical numbers. Jacob's redemption was not to be an isolated event. The unfolding page of revelation upon which this grand consummation is written is filled closely with other striking disclosures—events which, in character and magnitude, would, in a sense, form an era, were to crowd the written history of *those days* and *that time.* If, then, we can find *the events and their date* to which the context refers, we shall also find the chronology of Israel's and Judah's recovery. What these events were, will be seen in the verses immediately preceding the passages upon which we are now commenting. "The word which the Lord spake against Babylon and the Chaldeans, by Jeremiah the prophet. Declare ye among the nations, and publish, and set up a standard; publish and conceal not: say, Babylon is taken, Bel is confounded, Merodach is broken in pieces, her idols are confounded, her images are broken in pieces. For out of the north there cometh up a nation against her which shall make her land desolate, and none shall dwell therein; they shall remove, they shall depart, both man and beast." In those days, and in that time "shall Israel and Judah unite and come to Zion." Now whatever was the nature of the *visitation* here foretold, thus much is certain, that it concerns the very country in which, and the identical people among whom "the children of Israel and the children of Judah" were then held in captivity. There can be no room to doubt that these words are to be considered as an unmistakable denunciation not only against Babylon the capitol, but also against the whole Chaldean empire. They betoken a ruin so complete that they "shall remove . . . . both man and beast," and a judgment so protracted that "her land" shall be "desolate."

"In *those days* and *in that time*" when "Babylon is taken," when "Bel is confounded," and "Merodach is broken in pieces," when, in a word, the whole Chaldean power shall be subverted, Israel and Judah shall enter into the covenant specified, and return to their own land. The recovery of the captive tribes, synchronizing, as it does, with the fall of the "golden" empire, the same evidence in nature and amount which settles the chronology of the overthrow of Babylon, determines the date of the release of the families of Jacob. And in anticipation of the deliverance which would ensue to the Jews upon the predicted fall of their oppressors, the captives are directed

(ver. 8) to "remove out of the midst of Babylon, and go forth out of the land of the Chaldeans."

We now direct the reader's attention to what is said in verses 17–20 inclusive:—

> "Israel is a scattered sheep; the lions have driven him away: first the king of Assyria hath devoured him; and last this Nebuchadrezzar king of Babylon hath broken his bones. Therefore thus saith the Lord of hosts, the God of Israel; Behold, I will punish the king of Babylon and his land, as I have punished the king of Assyria. And I will bring Israel again to his habitation, and he shall feed on Carmel and Bashan, and his soul shall be satisfied upon Mount Ephraim and Gilead. In those days, and in that time, saith the Lord, the iniquity of Israel shall be sought for, and there shall be none; and the sins of Judah, and they shall not be found: for I will pardon them whom I reserve."

The evidence in this passage is, if possible, more direct than that furnished in the preceding quotation. Moreover, it contains several historical allusions which furnish means to identify the persons intended to be favoured by the interposition which is here promised. Here, as in the former citation,. the release of Israel is conjoined in time with the punishment of the king of Babylon. But who is meant by *Israel* in the seventeenth verse? Does it mean the ten tribes who were called Israel, or Judah, or does it mean all the descendants of Jacob? Beyond a single doubt it means the latter. And *the* punishment of the king of Babylon was that by which the kingdom of Chaldea was irretrievably ruined. This is shown by the minute historical allusions employed in the text. The king of Assyria is put in opposition to the king of Babylon, as the first oppressor of Israel. The first oppressor had scattered Israel, nay, he had devoured him, and "last this king of Babylon," who was even more rapacious than the "lion," had broken Israel's "bones." The distinction which is made here between Assyria and Babylon will be comprehended easily, if the reader recalls what has been said already in reference to the place and circumstances of the captivity of the respective parts of the family of Jacob. The ten tribes were carried away before the breaking up of the old Assyrian monarchy, whereas it was the Assyrians of Babylon who enslaved Judah and destroyed the temple at Jerusalem. Now except those Israelites who were in Media, all of the ten tribes were in Babylon, suffering under its power and tyranny. These circumstances clearly show that all the surviving descendants of the patriarch Jacob were included in the promise of restoration to their own land "*in those days and in that time*," when God would punish the king of Babylon *as* he punished the king of Assyria, which the Lord did by overturning the throne of Belshazzar, as, previously, he had the throne of Sardanapalus. And, besides, when the blessings are named which were to ensue to Israel

upon the occurrence of the revolutions specified, the true historical titles which represent the two branches of the house of Jacob are used, thereby putting it beyond the reach of successful controversy, that the ten tribes, as well as Judah, were to be partners of the promised redemption.

It will not be sufficient, however, that we show that Israel is made co-partner with Judah in the promise of recovery, for some might yet suppose that the prophecies which prove this single point are to have their fulfilment in a future exaltation of the house of Jacob. It becomes necessary, therefore, to show that the prophecies in question had their fulfilment at that particular time which would make the histories of Israel and Judah one since the termination of the seventy years' captivity in Babylon. We have no doubt that this point can be made out, fully, by a just exposition of the proof-texts which relate to this subject. None doubt that, soon after the fall of the Chaldean monarchy, Judah was brought back to his own country. We wish to show that it is just as indubitable that Israel also came home from his dispersion and servitude in the east at one and the same time with Judah. The confidence with which we speak upon this point is grounded in part upon the assumption that what God promised he has fulfilled in every instance where the chronological limitation of the promise has expired. If he promised Judah that at the close of seventy years' servitude in Babylon he would work out a deliverance for him, the specific character of the promise becomes evidence to the *fact* of Judah's emancipation. If this is the logical relation of these texts, it follows inevitably that if Israel is included with Judah in the scope of these promises, that Israel did share the boon of fulfilment with Judah. The following passage from Jer. l, 33–35, we quote with great confidence upon this point:—

> "Thus saith the Lord of hosts; The children of Israel and the children of Judah were oppressed together: and all that took them captives held them fast; they refused to let them go.
>
> "Their Redeemer is strong; the Lord of hosts is his name: he shall thoroughly plead their cause, that he may give rest to the land, and disquiet the inhabitants of Babylon.
>
> "A sword is upon the Chaldeans, saith the Lord, and upon the inhabitants of Babylon, and upon her princes, and upon her wise men."

We think there can be no question raised respecting the *place* in which this *common oppression* was endured, for the word "together" designates the *place* as well as the *time* of their sufferings. Where, but in Babylon, could they have been "oppressed together," either in respect to geographical position, or synchronical time, so as to have made it historically possible that their redemption should have been

as coincident in time as had been their place of oppression? Now, unless it can be shown that Judah suffered a *second* oppression in Babylon, it could not have been possible in the nature of things that Israel and Judah could have participated in a common release, unless Israel did actually partake of that which we know that Judah did obtain at the close of the "seventy years" specified in the language of prophecy. So far, then, as this text affords proof that Judah was redeemed from Babylon, it is proof that Israel did also obtain release from the clutches of his Chaldean oppressor. For none can deny that in the text both Israel and Judah are represented as having received the same treatment, as well in their deliverance as in their oppressions. That the fulfillment of this prophecy is limited to the period in history already alluded to, is proved by the fact that at that time Babylon "fell to rise to more." As a government it was utterly overthrown; it has never since revived. Everything, therefore, which would blend with the history of Babylon, must have occurred antecedent to the period about which we are writing, as thereafter she had no history to be written.

The *time* of this deliverance is therefore settled by indisputable historical evidence.

Let the reader note well the corroborative evidence of the following texts:—

> "*It shall come to pass, when seventy years are accomplished, that I will punish the king of Babylon, and that nation, saith the Lord, for their iniquity, and the land of the Chaldeans, and will make it perpetual desolations.*" Jer. xxv, 12.
>
> "*I will punish the king of Babylon . . . . and I will bring Israel again to his habitation . . . . the iniquity of Israel shall be sought for, and there shall be none; and the sins of Judah, and they shall not be found: for I will pardon them whom I reserve.*" Jer. l, 18–20.

If the period from which the *seventy years* date was B. C. 606, as is commonly supposed, then the captivity would *end* about B. C. 536, which is the date of Belshazzar's fall. The reader is requested to notice that Judah's recovery is connected, in date, with the punishment of the king of Babylon, which took place B. C. 536. Now, it is *the* recovery of Judah at that particular time to which the promises in the foregoing texts relate. But the name of Israel is coupled with that of Judah in the promises of deliverance at *the* time when God would "punish the king of Babylon." It will follow, therefore, as an uncontrollable, logical necessity, that the ten tribes of Israel were to be joint-heirs of the promised redemption. So far, then, as relates to the *time* in which these predictions were to be fulfilled, the evidence in the texts quoted is so full and direct that no logical advantage would ensue from the multiplication of parallel passages. We shall, therefore, pass on to the consideration of another class of

scriptures in which other branches of the general argument are unfolded.

It will be remembered that in the course of the prophetical revelations made concerning Judah's recovery from Babylon, the human agent of their release is announced by name. What we wish to show by the following quotations is, that *that particular release from foreign servitude, which Judah obtained through the clemency of* CYRUS, *was also enjoyed by Israel or the ten tribes.*

In Jeremiah li, 11, it is very plainly, but in general terms, announced that the overthrow of Babylon would be by the hand of the Medes. But Isaiah, in chapter xliii, is very direct and minute in proof upon this point. In verse 1, Jacob and Israel are addressed, the Lord saying to them, "Fear not, for I have redeemed thee;" and in verses five to seven inclusive, the Lord promises to bring their "seed from the east and gather them from the west." He says, "I will say to the north, Give up; and to the south, Keep not back: bring my sons from far, and my daughters from the ends of the earth. Every one that is called by my name; for I have created him for my glory, I have formed him, yea, I have made him."

But what does this gathering of "every one" of Jacob and Israel mean? And when was it to take place? These questions are in part answered by what is said in the fourteenth verse: "Thus saith the Lord, your Redeemer, the Holy One of Israel; For your sake I have sent to Babylon, and have brought down all their nobles, and the Chaldeans whose cry is in the ships." By whom did God send to dash in pieces the "golden cup?" The answer is given Isaiah xlv, 1–4, in the following testimony:—

> "Thus saith the Lord to his anointed, to Cyrus, whose right hand I have holden, to subdue nations before him; and I will loose the loins of kings, to open before him the two-leaved gates, and the gates shall not be shut; I will go before thee, and make the crooked places straight: I will break in pieces the gates of brass, and cut in sunder the bars of iron: and I will give thee the treasures of darkness, and hidden riches of secret places, that thou mayest know that I, the Lord, which call thee by thy name, am the God of Israel. For Jacob, my servant's sake, and Israel mine elect, I have even called thee by thy name: I have surnamed thee, though thou hast not known me."

There can be no doubt, we think, that in this prediction we have a clear preannouncement of the overthrow of Babylon by Cyrus. Nor is there reason to suppose that the text was to have any other than a plain historical fulfilment. What is here said respecting Cyrus as the conqueror of Babylon will be seen not to conflict with Daniel v, 31, where it is said that "Darius the Mede took the kingdom," if the following facts be well considered. Darius the Mede is the same as Cyaxares II., of profane history. Cyrus was the son

of Astyages, the third king of Media. He succeeded his father in government, and reigned for a period of thirty-five years. Mandane, the sister of Darius, had been given in marriage by his father to Cambyses, the king of Persia. Cyrus was the issue of this marriage, and was but one year the junior of his uncle Darius. Darius, therefore, as king of the nation by whom Babylon was subverted. may very well be spoken of as the conqueror, while Cyrus, as the acting leader of the conquering army, may have been, in a very special sense, "the rod of the Almighty," chosen to chastise the oppressors of his people.

In the citations now before the reader, there is an historical relation subsisting between the several points, revealed and promised, which clearly shows that this great gathering of the "seed of Jacob, (Isa. xliii, 5–7,) was to ensue upon the elevation and success of Cyrus, whom God had designated to be the deliverer of his oppressed people. But then it must be remembered that this was the gathering of *Jacob*, the redemption of *Israel*. The designations here employed, are never, so far as we now know, applied to Judah exclusively, especially when used in a plain historical sense. The conclusion is, therefore, unavoidable, that the ten tribes were included in the common redemption from bondage wrought out for Jacob by the hand of Cyrus.

Before closing the book of Isaiah we will direct the attention of the reader to the forty-eighth chapter, which gives concurrent testimony to the point under consideration. In the first verse is the following address: "Hear ye this, O house of Jacob, which are called by the name of Israel, and are come forth out of the waters of Judah, which swear by the name of the Lord, and make mention of the God of Israel, but not in truth nor in righteousness." Following this address is a sketch of their obstinacy and errors, from which they were to be refined by their afflictions in Babylon. This finished, they are called upon in the twentieth verse—"Go ye forth of Babylon, flee ye from the Chaldeans, with a voice of singing declare ye, tell this, utter it even to the end of the earth; say ye, The Lord hath redeemed his servant Jacob." The *time* of this redemption is shown by the fourteenth verse; it was to be realized when God should "*do his pleasure on Babylon.*" But who are they that are to "go forth of Babylon," and who are to "flee from Chaldea?" We answer, they are the same persons who in the first verse are called Jacob, alias Israel, *who came forth of the waters of Judah.* It only remains to show that the persons addressed in the first verse are the ten tribes of Israel, and then it will have been proved that they were recovered with Judah. The

true historical application of this passage very much depends upon the meaning of the metaphor of *water* here used to make out the description of the persons intended to be favoured by the interposition promised. There is a parallel use of this word in Rev. xvii. 15, where it is said, "the waters which thou sawest . . . . are peoples, and multitudes, and nations, and tongues." Here the word is used metaphorically to signify communities of persons, or persons in a collective sense. We see no ground to doubt that it is used in the same sense in the text under discussion. The description, therefore, refers to that portion of the family of Jacob who were called *Israel*, but specifically those *who came forth out of the waters of Judah;* that is, that branch of Jacob who separated themselves in a collective and governmental sense from Judah. These, surely, were the "ten tribes." At the time appointed *they* were to go out of Babylon, and flee from Chaldea. But how or when could they escape from their oppression, if it were not jointly with Judah? for the Medes were to make "Babylon, the glory of kingdoms, and the beauty of the Chaldees' excellency, ... as when God overthrew Sodom and Gomorrah." Isa. xiii, 19. The Lord had declared that he would "sweep" Babylon "with the besom of destruction;" that he would "cut off the name, and remnant, and son and nephew," from that land. And these denunciations have been so literally fulfilled, that had not Israel fled away he must have been annihilated with his doomed captor. Here then is positive evidence that the ten tribes of Israel were to be joint partakers with Judah of that deliverance from Babylon which would ensue upon the fall of that proud and powerful kingdom.

Having now shown the place of their captivity, the *time* and visible *agent* of their release—both of Israel and Judah—we shall proceed to examine some predictions, which, while they yield additional proof to the points already established, will exhibit other important views in the history of this general subject. And we desire the reader, as we proceed in this brief exegesis of texts, to note the accumulation of evidence, that the *subject-matter of these prophecies is purely historical.* This fact will be used hereafter, not only to justify the construction put upon these particular texts, but, also, as showing necessarily the truth of our main position.

In Jeremiah xxxiii, 7, 8, we have a strong point of evidence upon our main doctrine. Here it is said:—

> "And I will cause the captivity of Judah and the captivity of Israel to return, and I will build them, as at the first.
>
> "And I will cleanse them from all their iniquity, whereby they have sinned against me; and I will pardon all their iniquities whereby they have sinned, and whereby they have transgressed against me."

The captivity from which they were to return is shown, by verses 4 and 5, to be that which they were to endure in Chaldea for their sins and transgressions. But what is meant by the promises, "*will build them as at the first?*" And what proof does this afford, if any, that the ten tribes returned with Judah to the Holy Land? These questions are easily and satisfactorily answered. Many years before Jeremiah came into the prophetic scene, God had said by the mouth of Hosea (chap. i, 4)—"I will avenge the blood of Jezreel upon the house of Jehu, *and will cause to* CEASE *the* KINGDOM *of the house of Israel.*" This subversion took place when the house of Israel was carried away into the land of Assyria. From that day forth it never has existed as a *separate government.*

But, accompanying the prediction of their overthrow, is a promise of their recovery. A leading characteristic circumstance connected with their redemption is, that it was to be in connexion with Judah's restoration, and both henceforth were to be consolidated in *one* civil power. This is clearly the testimony in Hosea i, 11, where it is said, "Then shall the children of Judah and the children of Israel be gathered together, and appoint themselves one head, and they shall come up out of the land: for great shall be the day of Jezreel."

Here, then, it is shown, that to "build them as at the first" meant to *re*construct them into one government as they had existed in the days of David and Solomon. We have seen that the *government* of "the house of Israel" was broken up by the Assyrians—that as a separate kingdom it has never since existed. But the Lord promised that he would "cause the captivity of Judah and the captivity of Israel to return, and" would "build them as at the first." Here, then, we press the question, Did the Lord cause the captivity of Judah to return? Did he not, then, also cause the captivity of Israel to return? He did "cause to cease the *kingdom* of the house of Israel." Did not the Lord then also "build them as at the first?" We confess that we are unable to conjecture any reasonable ground for a negative answer to the implied conclusions to which these interrogatives lead. Indeed, the whole chapter (Jer. xxxiii) from which we are quoting is replete with evidence of the return of Israel with Judah to their own country, and of their joint-possession of their former inheritance. A few citations, however, must suffice. Verses 13 and 14:—

> "In the cities of the mountains, in the cities of the vale, and in the cities of the south, and in the land of Benjamin, and in the places about Jerusalem, and in the cities of Judah, shall the flocks pass again under the hands of him that telleth them, saith the Lord. Behold, the days come, saith the Lord, that I will perform that good thing which I have promised unto the house of Israel and to the house of Judah."

Again, verses 23–26:—

> "Moreover the word of the Lord came to Jeremiah, saying, Considerest thou not what this people have spoken, saying, The two families which the Lord hath chosen, he hath even cast them off? thus they have despised my people, that they should be no more a nation before them.
>
> "Thus saith the Lord; If my covenant be not with day and night, and if I have not appointed the ordinances of heaven and earth; then will I cast away the seed of Jacob, and David my servant, so that I will not take any of his seed to be rulers over the seed of Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob: for I will cause their captivity to return, and have mercy on them."

Now, when it is remembered that it was their enemies, even they who now held them in bondage, that tauntingly said, "The two families which the Lord hath chosen, he hath even cast them off," it will be easily seen that a construction is to be put upon the passage which will make God's reply to them a rebuke to their pride and assumption, and at the same time a promise to the "seed of Jacob" of release from the grasp of the ambitious and sneering Chaldean. To deny this would be to deprive the text of its significancy. The context, as all may see, requires that an application be allowed to the passage under discussion, which makes it yield direct and positive proof that Israel did return with Judah from Babylon to their own inheritance.

We now proceed to notice a few passages in the Book of Ezekiel. This prophet, it will be remembered, was one of the captives in Babylon. We mention this fact, in this connexion, merely to show that there is no chronological necessity to look below the *termination* of the captivity in Babylon to find the historical matter of those predictions which speak of the *recovery* and *reunion* of *all* the tribes of Israel. Now, unless there are solid reasons for referring them to a period subsequent to the one in question,—and they must be reasons founded in the terms employed, or in the general scope of the subject,—then we can see no just ground to doubt that these predictions were fulfilled at the time and in the manner which we have shown that corresponding prophecies have had their fulfilment, uttered by Isaiah and Jeremiah, who were contemporaries with Ezekiel. Indeed, in our judgment, a large portion of the prophecy of Ezekiel is occupied with the subject of Jacob's redemption from Babylon. It is not necessary to cite all the passages which it contains bearing upon the point under discussion. We intend little more than to indicate the nature of the testimony which abounds in this prophetic book.

We begin with chapter xvi, verse 53:—

> "When I shall bring again their captivity, the captivity of Sodom and her daughters, and the captivity of Samaria and her daughters, then will I bring again the captivity of thy captives in the midst of them."

Jerusalem, on account of her great wickedness, is here called Sodom; and Samaria, for a corresponding reason, is styled her sister. These two cities were respectively the seats of government of Judah and Israel; and consequently, by a figure of speech, they are put for the people which were represented in them. When the prophet announced their *common release*, they both were in captivity in Babylon. Now, unless this prophecy was fulfilled by the return of both branches of the house of Jacob from Babylon, during the time of Cyrus, we confess to an inability to see how it can be fulfilled at all, inasmuch as it is undeniable that at that time "Sodom and her daughters" were brought back; but if "Samaria and her daughters" were left, then, by the nature of the case, there could be no *community* in the boon announced, and this is the characteristic point shown by the passage.

We pass to the consideration of evidence upon our main point, contained in the thirty-seventh chapter of this prophecy. And as it would occupy a larger space than can be allowed to it in this brief discussion, to quote all that is necessary to a perfect understanding of the view which we wish to place before our readers, we must beg them to verify for themselves several things which we shall assume as true in our exposition. We shall, however, give a very brief analysis of several chapters preceding the one to which we have specially alluded, as thereby the reader will more easily comprehend the evidence we adduce from it in favour of our main subject.

Our purpose will be answered by commencing with chapter xxiii, in which the idolatries of Israel and Judah are portrayed by the metaphor of two lewd women, (1–21.) Following this description of their character, is a denunciation of severe judgment against them, (22–49.) In chapter xxiv, 1–14, Jerusalem is particularized by the enormity of her crimes, and the severity of her punishment under the figure of a boiling pot: but it was a reward so well merited that the prophet is forbidden to "weep" or "mourn" for his dead, (15–27.) In chapter xxv, it is announced that God, in turn, would punish the enemies of Israel; and in chapter xxix, verse 21, after having foretold the overthrow of Egypt by Nebuchadrezzar, it is said, "In that day will I cause the horn of Israel to bud forth," which showed the incipient working of a system of means by which God would accomplish their emancipation, as it is described in chapter xxxvi.

We now ask the reader's attention to the subject-matter of the thirty-seventh chapter. Here is contained the famous vision of "a valley full of bones," (verse 1.) While the prophet was gazing, mournfully, upon the symbolical remains of a once great and prosperous

people, the Lord asks him if these bones can live, (verse 3,) and then commands him to prophesy unto these bones, and say unto them, " O ye dry bones, hear the word of the Lord," (verse 4.) Now, although it has been thought by some expositors that this vision related to something in intimate connexion with the dispensation of the gospel, and the future restoration of the Jews under its ministrations, and by others to be a prophetic representation of the final resurrection, we are of the opinion that it had its complete realization in the political revivification of the house of Jacob. Indeed, if respect is to be had to the exposition of the vision which God gave to the prophet at the very time when he was favoured with this insight into the future, its application thereby must be deemed to have been settled. We, therefore, feel safe in submitting our judgment to the evidence in the case.

In verse 11 God told the prophet that "*these bones are the* WHOLE HOUSE OF ISRAEL." But the question will at once arise, What is intended by the resurrection of these bones? The answer is at hand in verses 12, 13, and 14, and is in the following language, namely:—

> " Therefore prophesy and say unto them, Thus saith the Lord God; Behold, O my people, I will open your graves, and cause you to come up out of your graves, and bring you into the land of Israel.
>
> " And ye shall know that I am the Lord, when I have opened your graves, O my people, and brought you up out of your graves.
>
> " And shall put my Spirit in you, and ye shall live, and I shall *place* you in *your own land:* then shall ye know that I the Lord have spoken it, and performed it, saith the Lord."

By a proper attention to the facts relating to the history of the house of Israel at the time when this prediction was uttered, and also to the explicitness of the language employed in the exposition of the vision itself, an easy and natural sense of the passage can be gained.

The "whole house of Israel" was in captivity at the time when the prophet saw that "valley of bones." About twenty of the seventy years of the period for which they were doomed had already past away. The sufferers had said, (verse 11,) " Our bones are dried, and our hope is lost: we are cut off for our parts." The muscles and sinews of the tribes had been torn asunder, and devoured by a rapacious enemy. In order, therefore, to prevent utter despair throughout the house of Jacob, God directed the prophet to say to them that *these dry bones should live;* that he would cause their graves to be opened, and would bring them up out of their graves, and cause them to come into their own land again. These *dry bones,* then, were the *skeletons* of the tribes of Jacob. They were stripped

of every social and political function by their heathen conquerors. Their *grave* was Babylon, where now were buried their national franchises and honour; in a word, all that they held dear in the institutions of their fathers and of their God. The resurrection promised, then, was the reinstatement of the nation in the land of Israel. This, we believe, to be the only true sense of this remarkable passage. Now, if we are correct in this opinion, and shall be able to show that the phrase, "the whole house of Israel," includes the ten tribes, then the passage becomes positive proof of the return of all the tribes, and of their reunion in government and the social state at the close of "the seventy years' captivity."

The phrase itself, if it be considered in its relation to the subject to which it is applied, were it not that traditive prepossessions often influence the judgment, would be deemed proof that the application which we have given it is just and true, although no exegetical testimony were at hand to support it. But we are happy to say that the construction now given it is most amply and satisfactorily corroborated by evidence which precludes a doubt as to its import in the connexion in which it occurs. This is furnished in verses fifteenth to twenty-second inclusive:—

> "The word of the Lord came again unto me, saying, Moreover, thou son of man, take thee one stick, and write upon it, For Judah, and for the children of Israel his companions: then take another stick, and write upon it, For Joseph, the stick of Ephraim, and for all the house of Israel his companions:
>
> "And join them one to another into one stick; and they shall become one in thy hand.
>
> "And when the children of thy people shall speak unto thee, saying, Wilt thou not show us what thou meanest by these?
>
> "Say unto them, Thus saith the Lord God; Behold, I will take the stick of Joseph, which is in the hand of Ephraim, and the tribes of Israel his fellows, and will put them with him, even with the stick of Judah, and make them one stick, and they shall be one in my hand.
>
> "And the sticks whereon thou writest shall be in thy hand before their eyes.
>
> "And say unto them, Thus saith the Lord God; Behold, I will take the children of Israel from among the heathen, whither they be gone, and will gather them on every side, and bring them into their own land:
>
> "And I will make them one nation in the land upon the mountains of Israel; and one king shall be king to them all: and they shall be no more two nations, neither shall they be divided into two kingdoms any more at all."

It is not necessary to multiply words upon a passage so direct and full in its evidence of the truth of the doctrine now under consideration. The vision of the resurrection of the "dry bones" is then direct and positive proof, as far as the foretelling of an event can be evidence that the event has taken place, that the whole *house of Israel* were recovered from their dispersion in Assyria and Babylon, and restored to their own land by Cyrus, according to the divine promise. And now the evidence of our position becomes

cumulative; for having declared his purpose to restore the *whole* "house of Israel," the Lord proceeds to shew by what steps this great event was to be brought about. (See chapters xxxviii and xxxix.) In the latter chapter, in verses 25, 26, God renews his promise to restore the whole "house of Israel;" and in anticipation of their coming to dwell in their land, full directions are given for the rebuilding of the temple, and the celebration of its holy services; and the book is concluded, beginning at the thirteenth verse of chapter xlvi, with directions for a repartition of the land to *the twelve tribes by name.*

Our readers cannot have failed to notice one characteristic of all the scriptures which we have quoted, namely, that Israel and Judah are constantly united in the promise of redemption from Babylon. And those selected are from a class of promises which none can doubt were fulfilled in relation to Judah, under Cyrus. But why should we question their fulfillment, also, in relation to Israel? It may be replied that the return of Judah is a matter of written history, and, therefore, all doubt in respect to it is precluded; whereas no such testimony exists in relation to Israel, consequently it is reasonable to suppose that they never returned from their dispersion in the east. Were this assumption true, it would be a formidable difficulty in the way of our conclusion. We have foreseen that with many candid minds, who will readily allow the fairness and legitimacy of our exposition of the proof-texts, it will be felt that a link is wanting, in direct and positive historical testimony, in order to connect the exposition with the doctrine that hereby the argument may be completed.

We cheerfully admit that it would be an anomaly if Israel did return from Babylon that no mention is made of that fact, since Judah is so repeatedly spoken of in the even partial history of that people subsequent to the building of the second temple. This apparent silence in relation to Israel need, however, occasion no surprise, for, from the day that Samaria fell by the hand of the Assyrian conqueror, *the* KINGDOM *of the house of Israel* CEASED TO EXIST. The last scene of its history was exhibited in the tragedy of its explosion. Like the ship upon the ocean, when her magazine is fired, as soon as the first shock of ruin is past, she disappears from the face of the waters. The mission of that kingdom had been fulfilled. God had punished the pride and disobedience of Solomon. (1 Kings xi, 9–13; xii, 15.) Moreover, Israel in turn had become corrupt, and God had denounced the kingdom, (Hos. i, 4,) and the denunciation had been terribly fulfilled in the overthrow of the government and the captivity of the people. This was a *final destruction of*

their governmental character. The page of history which they had been accustomed to occupy became a blank, for the sufficient reason that all national functions having become extinct, there was no action to be recorded.

There is another fact which will greatly aid us in accounting for this seeming silence respecting the history of the "ten tribes." And, moreover, it is a fact which will serve to conduct us to the positive historical evidence which is so great a desideratum in completing our argument upon this subject. To fully comprehend it, it is necessary that we carefully notice the Bible use of the various *appellations* given to the Jews, as a nation, and their application when employed to represent the respective branches into which the Jews were divided during the successive periods embraced in their history. By overlooking this important circumstance the reader may be easily misled, or at least confused, in his knowledge of the subject.

Before the disruption of the nation, under the administration of the successor of Solomon, their common title was Israel, the name of the father of the tribes, or Jacob. Subsequent to the rebellion this name was appropriated to the ten tribes, because, it may be presumed, they formed the larger portion of the descendants of these good and reverend men. During their separate national existence, the ten tribes are also called Samaria, Ephraim, and Joseph. These latter titles arose, it is likely, from the following circumstances:—Samaria, the metropolis of Israel, was situated in the portion of Ephraim, who was the son of Joseph. While the division of the nation continued, the tribes of Judah and Benjamin were denominated Judah, because that was the regal family. They were also called the "house of David," because from David descended the legitimate line of kings. At other times they were called Jerusalem and Zion, for the former was the capital of the kingdom, and embraced within its precincts Mount Sion. But subsequently to the close of "the seventy years' captivity," the names Judah and Israel are applied to all Jews indifferently, irrespective of any previous use of them as employed to distinguish the two branches of the nation, as before stated.* This latter fact is capable, when duly considered, of lending important aid in clearing up several things in relation to the history of the ten tribes, and also of assisting us to identify the actual evidence of their return, which is to be found in the historical records of the nation made subsequently to the return of the Jews from Babylon. Abundant proof and illustration of these points exist in the books of Zechariah, Haggai, and Malachi, and also in the histories of Ezra and Nehemiah, all of whom wrote

* See Horne's Int., vol. i, p. 388.

after the expiration of the "seventy years." But what do Ezra and Nehemiah say upon the general question? Do they, or either of them, say anything bearing upon the point now under discussion? If they do, all will allow that their testimony, if relevant to the case, must be competent to settle the question. But, then, it must not be forgotten that absolute silence on this point would not prove that the "ten tribes" did *not* return to their country; for, as *Israel*, they had no character to figure upon the page of history; and, besides, from the time that the divine promise was fulfilled in making them ONE *again*, the same title, whatever it be that is employed, comprises the whole nation.

Let us now turn to these books, and examine the testimony which they give upon the points in question. In Ezra vi, 16, are the following words:—"And the children of Israel, the priests, and the Levites, and the rest of the children of the captivity, kept the dedication of this house of God with joy?". (See also verses 21, 22.) Now, here occur the old-established designations of the nation which were used previous to their division. *The children of Israel, the priests, and the Levites*, comprehended all the distinctions among them which were founded upon the law; and, except for some particular reason, the people were never otherwise entitled than *Israel*, or the *children of Israel*. It follows, then, unavoidably, that Ezra uses the term Israel to represent all the descendants of Jacob, or else to mean the *ten tribes*, so that, in either case, the proof of their return is clear and conclusive. (See also chapters iii, 1; ix, 1; x, 1 and 25.)

Nor is the testimony of Nehemiah less conclusive. One passage we quote from chapter i, verse 6:—"Let thine ear now be attentive, and thine eyes open, that thou mayest hear the prayer of thy servant which I pray before thee now, day and night, for the children of Israel thy servants, and confess the sins of the children of Israel, which we have sinned against thee: both I and my father's house have sinned." In chapter x, 39, Nehemiah makes the same distinctions which were made by Ezra. See Neh. ix, 1, 2; xi, 3; and xiii, 3; also Bishop Patrick's note on Ezra vi, 16.

We pass to 1 Chron. ix, 2, 3:—"Now the first inhabitants that dwelt in their possessions in their cities were, the Israelites, the priests, Levites, and the Nethinims. And in Jerusalem dwelt of the children of Judah, and of the children of Benjamin, and of the children of Ephraim, and Manasseh." Upon the second verse as above quoted, Dr. A. Clarke has the following note:—

> "This is spoken of those who returned from the Babylonish captivity, and of the time in which they returned; for it is insinuated here that *other persons afterward* settled at Jerusalem, though these mentioned here were the

first on the return from captivity. Properly speaking the *whole* of the Israelitish people, who were, ever since the days of Joshua, divided into the *four* following classes:—1. The *priests*. 2. The *Levites*. 3. The *common people* or *simple* Israelites. 4. The Nethinims or *slaves of the temple*."

In confirmation of our method of proof, we will add Mr. Benson's note upon the same text:—

> "The common people of Judah and Israel, called here by the general name of Israelites, which was given them before that unhappy division of the kingdoms; and now is restored to them when the Israelites are united with the Jews in one and the same commonwealth, that so all the names and signs of their former divisions might be blotted out."

We do not wish to insinuate that either Dr. Clarke or Mr. Benson believed that the "ten tribes" returned with Judah. The latter we know did not; nor have we any good reasons for thinking that the former did. And yet it ought not to be thought impertinent in us if we do *inquire* how Judah and Israel could be united *in one and the same commonwealth*, as Mr. Benson affirms them to have been after the captivity, if the *latter* did not return with the *former* from their dispersion? Nor are we able to see how the disbelief of these eminent commentators in the point of doctrine which we are attempting to establish can lessen the value of the incidental proof which their exposition of an important fact gives to the proposition under discussion. They respectively confirm what we have said in reference to the use of the terms Israel and Israelites. Nor could they have done otherwise without palpably disregarding the testimony of the third verse that the children of Ephraim and Manasseh dwelt in Jerusalem. But all know that *these* were *two* of the ten tribes. And how could they have dwelt with Judah if they did not return with him? It may be answered that "a few of the Israelites, availing themselves of the decree of Cyrus, did return, but that the great body of them remained in the countries to which they had been carried." We reply, that it is much easier to assert this than it would be to prove it, except by Josephus. And however we might be disposed to yield our assent to the testimony of this historian in ordinary cases, yet when the truth lies between him and such witnesses as the inspired prophets, we must believe the latter whatever becomes of the opinions of the former. God has said by the mouth of Isaiah, (xliii, 5–7,) "*I will bring every one that is called by my name from the east, west, north and south, even from the ends of the earth.*" Now if there are any *exceptions* in the case they must be on the other side of the question. The rule is that they came back; the exception, (if any,) that they remained. This is so, we mean, *if* it is *safe* to conclude that God *fulfilled his promise.*

A few references to New Testament authorities shall conclude

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

our discussion, for the present, of this subject. We intend little more than to cite a few texts in confirmation of the preceding facts and reasonings employed to support our main position. The few selected are so clearly relevant to the point, and, withal, so obviously conclusive, that, in our judgment, more numerous selections would be superfluous. We begin with Acts xxvi, 7: "Unto which promise our TWELVE TRIBES, instantly serving God day and night, hope to come." Here is, undeniably, a plain recognition of the whole house of Jacob. Then they were not lost. And if the apostle knew that they were not lost, which he must have known, if he could justify himself for what he asserts, he also knew where they were at that time. The common sense of men in general would, by this allusion, locate them in the land which God had given to their fathers.

Again, the General Epistle of James bears the following significant dedication:—Chap. i, ver. i, "James, a servant of God and of the Lord Jesus Christ, to the *twelve tribes* which are scattered abroad, greeting." The style of address through the epistle, the particularity with which he portrays the conduct of some, followed by appropriate admonition and warning, all contribute to show that St. James had a particular knowledge of the personal character of those whom he addressed. But how could he have possessed the information by which his epistle was dictated if he had no opportunity either by personal observation, or through the observation of some co-labourer, both of which would have been precluded if the twelve tribes did not then exist within the circle of apostolical administration. The text, then, must be allowed as direct proof that the twelve tribes were numbered among the immediate objects of apostolic labour and solicitude; or, (which would be a great absurdity,) it must be confessed that this epistle was sent forth at random, and, as a necessary consequence, without any intelligent motive. The first conclusion is by far the most reasonable.

Dr. Macknight has a very singular note upon this passage, which has been quoted by both Dr. Clarke and Mr. Benson: As the case now stands the influence of these great and good men lies against the doctrine of this paper. As Dr. Macknight most assuredly, in this case, has himself been misled, and consequently misguided those who have followed him, we feel fully authorized to apply a corrective to the influence of their error. They all allow the existence of the twelve tribes, but suppose that they were not in their former possessions, and that the ten tribes had not been there since their dispersion in the East. He says:—

> "Notwithstanding Cyrus allowed all the Jews in his dominions to return to their own land, many of them did not return. This happened agreeably to

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

God's purpose in permitting them to be carried captive into Assyria and Babylon; *for he intended to make himself known among the heathen by means of the knowledge of his being and perfections, which the Jews in their dispersion would communicate to them. This, also, was the reason that God determined that the ten tribes should never return to their own land.* Hos. i, 6; viii, 9; ix, 3, 15–17."

It will be sufficient to quote one of Dr. Macknight's proof-texts in support of the above quotation, and especially the part which is emphatic, for the remaining allusions are only repetitions of the same threatening that is contained in the following language:—"And she conceived again, and bare a daughter. And God said unto him, Call her name Lo-ruhamah: for I will no more have mercy upon the house of Israel; but I will utterly take them away." Hos. i, 6.

Now, had Dr. Macknight consulted Zech. viii, 13–15, he would have been saved from the mistake into which he has fallen, and led others, by the construction which he has put upon the language of Hosea. The Lord had said by the mouth of Zechariah:—

> "It shall come to pass, that as ye were a curse among the heathen, O house of Judah, and house of Israel; so will I save you, and ye shall be a blessing: fear not, but let your hands be strong. For thus saith the Lord of hosts: As I thought to punish you, when your fathers provoked me to wrath, saith the Lord of hosts, and I repented not: so again have I thought in these days to do well unto Jerusalem and to the house of Judah: fear ye not."

See also Jer. xxxi, 27–30. A little attention to the chronology of these citations will enable us to put this matter in its true light before the reader. Hosea wrote about B. C. 785, and Zechariah about B. C. 520, or 265 years later than Hosea. It is easy, now, to see the perfect irrelevancy of Dr. Macknight's quotations from Hosea to support the assertion that Israel should never return to his own land. For although God had threatened them with ceaseless expatriation, yet he afterward relaxed and promised them a restoration. He had said by the mouth of Amos, (chap. ix, 10, B. C. 787,) "All the sinners of my people shall die by the sword," yet by the mouth of Zechariah, (chap. x, 6, B. C. 587,) he promised that he would "bring them [the house of Joseph] again to place them, . . . and they shall be as though I had not cast them off." The Israelites who were carried away for their idolatry perished in the captivity, but their children God brought back to the land of their fathers. In this God gave a clear illustration of what he had said by Jeremiah, (xxxi, 29, 30.) The reader can now see that not anything which Hosea had said concerning the extermination of the house of Israel can be employed as proof that the ten tribes did not return from their dispersion, because it is shown by later prophets that the Lord changed his purpose in this respect, and historians record the fact that they did return.

As, then, the "twelve tribes" mentioned in the text under investigation cannot, with any propriety, be taken in the sense in which the commentators before mentioned have applied the designation, we are compelled to the belief that the *scattering* was that which is recorded in Acts viii, 1, and is alluded to again Acts xi, 19. By comparing the date of St. James's epistle with that of the persecution above mentioned, this opinion will be made probable to a degree, little, if any, less than certainty itself. The Epistle of St. James, by Dr. Lardner, Mr. Benson, and others, is supposed to have been written about the year A. D. 61; and the persecution in question took place about the year A. D. 32: so that the "persecution" by which the Christians were scattered abroad "as far as Phenice, and Cyprus, and Antioch," occurred at least a quarter of a century before the date of the Epistle of James. These facts, the unbiassed reader will see, help to an unconstrained exposition, by which the text yields direct and positive proof that the twelve tribes, in a collective sense, were in the Holy Land, or at least within the knowledge of the apostles in the days of Jesus Christ, and of their own personal ministry.

We have now placed before our readers as much of the argumentative testimony upon this point as we deem necessary at this time. It may not, possibly, induce in their minds the same degree of conviction which it has wrought in our own. Still, however, if it should do no more than lead them to a careful review of their own sentiments upon the question, and thereby make them more familiar with the sacred record, our humble effort will not have been made in vain. And hereby, also, evidence may be evolved by which the faith of the Church shall be settled, and her zeal and efforts on behalf of Israel shall be wisely and efficiently directed for their salvation.

In a subsequent article we intend to exhibit the Bible evidence upon the subject of *Jewish restoration*, in which strong corroborative proof will be given of the justness of our expositions from the prophets which have been cited in this paper.

ART. VI.—ROMAN SLAVERY.

SLAVERY existed among the Romans from the earliest period of their history; yet it was not until their numerous wars had supplied them with hordes of captives, that the system was developed in its worst features.

In the Roman law liberty was defined to be "naturalis facultas ejus quod cuique facere libet, nisi siquid vi aut jure prohibetur," that is, the natural ability of doing what one pleases, unless hindered by violence or law. In the same code, slaves are said to be called *servi*, from *servare*, because the conqueror preserves his captives for sale, and does not kill them. For by the laws of war, as it was then carried on, the vanquished forfeited his right to life; hence, if his life was spared, he became the property of his conqueror. But the condition of servitude was always spoken of as contrary to nature. These prisoners of war were sold for the benefit of the public treasury, or reserved as public slaves for the service of the state. This may be considered the common origin of slavery.

Slavery also resulted from the condition of birth. All the children of female slaves were *jure gentium* slaves, and belonged to the master of the mother, whether the father was free or a bondman; the law holding that where there was no *connubium*, that is, lawful wedlock, (and there could be none if either party were a slave,) the child followed the condition of the mother: *partus sequitur matrem*.

Even a freeborn Roman might become a slave; for the debtor who failed to fulfil his obligations was liable to be sold into slavery. The law was, that if the debtor, within a specified period after the debt was proved, failed to satisfy his creditor, he was given over to him as his bondman. Persons who had no property were obliged in borrowing money to give security under the form of a sale of themselves. If they were unable to pay their debts they passed into the hands of their creditors and were exposed to all the hardships of slavery. Many a poor Roman was reduced to slavery from inability to pay his debts, and his wife and children were liable to share his fate.*

The slave among the Romans passed for a human being, yet

---

* "During the first half of the Samnite war, but in what year is uncertain, there was passed that famous law which prohibited personal slavery for debt; no creditor might for the future attach the person of his debtor, but he might only seize his property."—*Arnold's Rome*, vol. ii., p. 277, (Eng. ed.)

he had no personal rights. The code said, "Quod attinet ad jus civile servi pro nullis habentur, non tamen et jure naturali, quia quod ad jus naturale attinet omnes homines æquales sunt."*—*Digest* i, 19, 32.

The master had the entire right of property in the slave, and could do as he pleased with his person, his powers, his earnings. He could punish, torment, or put him to death at his own will, without being called to account. And this privilege of the master continued down to a late period in the history of Rome, certainly all through the time of the republic. The arbitrary exercise of such unlimited power, which in the early times had been restrained only by the authority of the censors, was gradually checked by positive enactment; first by the Petronian law, which forbade the master to give up his slave to fight with wild beasts without the sentence of a judge. The emperor Claudius also took measures to check the cruelty of masters; but for the first time, under Adrian and afterward under Antoninus Pius, with severer penalties attached, it was enacted that any master who should wilfully put a slave to death, should be just as liable to punishment as if he had taken the life of a person over whom he had no control. A practice which prevailed among the Greeks was also introduced by Antoninus, that if a slave fled to a sanctuary to escape from the cruelty of his master, he could not be brought out by force, but his master was obliged to sell him.

With the earnings of the slave, the Roman law was not as generous as the Greek; for though among the Greeks, slaves were considered merely as property, yet there were many who worked at trades and retained their earnings, after paying their masters a trifling tax. It is true, the Roman slave could acquire a little property, but in the eyes of the law this belonged to the master, and might be retained by him even if the slave should be manumitted.

As the slave was not considered a person, but a thing having no legal rights, every injury done to him concerned only the master; and to the master must satisfaction be given and restitution made. On the other hand, the master was responsible for all offences committed by the slave. He could, however, free himself from the responsibility in cases of private injury, by giving up the slave to the injured party. The punishment of offences against the master was left to be inflicted by himself.

By the Roman law, if a master was found murdered in his house,

---

* That is, in the view of the civil law, slaves are not accounted persons; yet it is different in the law of nature, for by the law of nature all men are equal.

all his slaves were liable to be put to death. The necessity for so severe a law was argued in the Senate, on the ground that in no other way could the murder of masters be effectually prevented. Every slave would be bound by love for his own life to protect his master's. The first decree of the Senate in reference to this was enacted under Augustus. According to Tacitus, its provisions were made still more stringent under Nero. Tacitus says (*Annals*, 13, 42):—"A decree passed the Senate to protect the lives of masters by the punishment of offending slaves. With this view it was decreed that in case of a master slain by his slaves, not only all actual slaves, but those who had received their freedom and were living under the roof of the deceased at the time of his murder, should be put to death." This law was executed with the utmost rigour in A. D. 61, on the occasion of the prefect of the city being slain by one of his slaves.* According to the strict letter of the law every slave in the family was liable to be put to death; but the people, pitying the fate of so many innocent persons, assembled in crowds to oppose the execution of the law. Then the emperor issued a proclamation, and all the streets leading to the place of execution were lined with soldiers under arms, and the unhappy victims, to the number of four hundred, were put to death.

The general treatment of slaves varied, of course, according to the disposition of the master. From some allusions in the classical writers, we might infer that in the main they were well treated and enjoyed many liberties. But we must bear in mind that these writers are speaking of the *vernæ*, or house slaves, those that had been brought up in the family; or of the educated slaves, who were often of great service to the master, and added much to his income. We read but little in reference to the treatment of the field slaves, who were employed on the large landed estates of the Roman aristocracy. On each of these estates was the *ergastulum*, or jail, in which the slaves were probably locked up for the night, like prisoners in our penitentiaries. The groans from these houses of bondage have not come down to us in the literature of that age, and it is only from an occasional reference that we infer the prevalence of a system of cruelty to the slave far worse than that practised in the cities.

The obedience of slaves was enforced by severe discipline. The rod and the lash were in frequent use; but these were not the most severe instruments of punishment. Burning alive is mentioned in the Pandects; and Tertullian says it was at first only the punishment of slaves. Crucifixion was the fate of the wretched slave,

---

* Tacitus, Annals, 14, 42.

even for a slight misconduct. Thus in Juvenal a cruel mistress is represented as ordering the crucifixion of a slave:—*

> "'Pone crucem servo.' 'Meruit quo crimine servus
> Supplicium? Quis testis adest? Quis detulit? Audi,
> Nulla unquam de morte hominis cunctatio longa est.'
> 'O demens! ita servus homo est? Nil fecerit, esto,
> Hoc volo, sic jubeo, sit pro ratione voluntas.'"—SAT. vi, 218.

That slaves were barbarously treated in Cicero's time, we infer from some of his orations. Thus, in his oration Pro Cluentio, § 66, he says, "*Nam Stratonem quidem, judices, in crucem actum esse exsecta scitote lingua.*"† Cruel masters sometimes hired professional torturers. The opprobrious epithets applied to slaves indicate that they were frequently cruelly treated. Those who had been branded with a hot-iron were termed *stigmatii*, or *literati*. These marks remained visible for life, unless great pains were taken to conceal or remove them. Slaves who became free and rich, tried to hide them with plasters. Martial‡ speaks of a physician who knew how to efface the traces of former branding.

Another cruel punishment was suspending the slave by the hands, with weights attached to the feet, and inflicting blows at the same time. A very common punishment in early times, frequently alluded to by Plautus, was carrying the *furca*. This was in the form of a V, and was placed over the back of the neck upon the shoulders, while the hands were bound fast to the thighs.

So general was the ill treatment of slaves that men who, in other respects, are mentioned as noble and upright, thought it no discredit to treat them worse than their cattle. Thus we read that Cato, the censor, would often after supper take a thong and flog such of his slaves as had not attended properly. He also excited quarrels among them to prevent their plotting against him.§ Plutarch, in condemnation of Cato, says, "I must regard it altogether too hard in him, that after he had used his slaves like cattle till they were old, he should drive

---

* "'Go, crucify that slave.' 'For what offence?
Who's the accuser? Where the evidence?
Hear all: no time, whatever time we take
To sift the cause, when a man's life's at stake,
Can e'er be long: hear all, then, I advise.'
'Dolt! idiot! Is a slave a man?' she cries.
'He's innocent; be it so: 'tis my command,
My will; let that, sir, for a reason stand.'"
GIFFORD'S JUVENAL.

† "Know, O judges, that Strato was crucified, after having his tongue cut out."

‡ Epigram x, 56, 6.

§ Vita Catonis, § 5.

them forth and sell them; which implies that one man stands to another in no relation except that of gain, whereas we may see that a greater province is to be conceded to affection than to mere legal right. I at least would never sell an old labouring ox, and much less would I part with an old slave, who had grown up on the same soil with myself, and been accustomed to the same mode of life, and drive him forth, as it were, from his country, and sell him for a little money. But Cato, who, in this point, went to an extreme, even left behind him the horse he had used in Spain, that he might save the state the cost of his transportation. Now, whether this be magnanimity or a standing upon trifles, I leave each one to judge."

In the time of the emperors the ingenuity of cruel masters seemed tasked to invent new forms of torture, and the treatment of slaves was horrible in the extreme. We might multiply quotations from Juvenal and Martial to prove this. The greatest punishments were often inflicted for most trivial offences. Seneca says the poor slave had to stand all night at the pillow of his dissipated master, and perform most loathsome menial offices for him. A cough, a sneeze, or a gentle whisper was considered a great offence, as it disturbed the quiet of the debauched reveller, and was punished with the severest scourging.

There is the well-known story of the slave who accidentally broke a crystal vase at an entertainment where Augustus was present. His master immediately ordered him to be thrown to the fishes; and although Augustus interceded for his life, the inhuman master had the sentence executed. Such masters sometimes suffered terrible retribution from the vengeance of their slaves. Pliny* tells us that the slaves of Largius Macedo, whose father had himself been a slave, suddenly attacked him as he was bathing at his villa. After cruelly maiming and mutilating him, they threw him upon the glowing pavement of the bath to see if life were extinct. Pliny adds that he lived long enough to have the solace of revenge.

The early Romans, from their simple habits of life, required the service of but few slaves. Toward the end of the republic, when Rome, by her wealth and conquests, had brought hordes of slaves to her capital, an almost incredible number were kept by the nobility. It was customary to have a slave for almost every distinct work. Cicero speaks of the meanness of the household of Piso, because the same slave served for cook, and for taking care of the reception-room. In the houses of the wealthy Romans, there were slaves who acted as their master's stewards, attending to all their money transactions, and sometimes engaging in trade on their master's account,

* Epis. iii, 14.

for it was not reputable for the senator or patrician to be engaged directly in trade.

There was a class of slaves, and quite important functionaries they were, whose business was to bear the *lectica*, or sedan-chair, for their master or mistress. The strongest and best-looking slaves were selected for this duty—Syrians, Celts, Germans, and Cappadocians. Before them went another class of slaves, called *anteambulones*, whose business was to clear the way for the *lectica*, which they did by crying out, *Date locum domino meo.* The Romans were fond of this kind of display, and we find mention made of outriders before their carriages as early as the first century of our era.

The class of slaves called *nomenclatores* were considered very necessary to those who desired to attain office from the people. It was the business of these slaves to attend their master in his walks through the city, or to stand by his side when he received his morning visitors, and announce to him the name of each person he met, or each one that called upon him; for the common people expected many little attentions from those who asked for their votes. The houses of the aspirants for public honours must be open to all who called, and they were themselves expected to speak by name to each one they met in their walks through the city.

There were separate classes of slaves in the houses of the great to take care of the clothes of the master, to attend him when he dined abroad, to take charge of his garments and shoes, and, as guests furnished their own napkins, to carry these. This latter custom went out of fashion, as it was found the slave would use the napkin to wrap up any light article he could pilfer.

We find that slaves worked in almost every capacity, and occupied almost every position in trades and professions. Where slavery is so general, labour becomes disreputable, and at Rome trade and commerce, unless on an extensive scale, were considered mean and unworthy of the free-born Roman.[*] Hence the slave carried on the business transactions of his master. The slave was the teacher, the artist, the actor, the man of science, the physician.

The study of medicine was but little attended to at Rome in the early ages, and at a later period the practice was almost exclusively given up to foreigners, generally Greeks. The first practitioners were received with distrust and positive aversion. The elder Cato warned his son against medicine and the Greek physicians. He seems to have had more confidence in his receipt-book, filled with

---

[*] Cicero (de Officiis, i, 42) says: Opificesque omnes in sordida arte versantur; nec enim quidquam ingenuum potest habere officina. And again: Mercatura autem, si tenuis sordida putanda est.

traditionary medical lore, than in the skill of the disciples of Hippocrates. Doubtless the Romans had reason to distrust these early physicians, for there were probably many quacks among them. Plautus scourges them without mercy in his rough jokes; and Pliny considers them lawful game, for in one place he says, "Only a doctor is allowed to kill a man with impunity." As professional physicians were looked upon so unfavourably, the Romans employed trusty slaves as house-physicians. Female slaves were also employed in this capacity, as we find from inscriptions on their tombs. About the time of Tiberius, mention is made of oculists, dentists, and those skilled in the treatment of local disorders. The price of physicians was very low, only about $250, while a skilful cook brought almost any price, and an accomplished actor was thought worth $8000.

A class of educated slaves were employed as readers; for it was the custom of literary men, when at their meals or in the baths, to have some one read to them. The younger Pliny mentions this as the habit of his uncle, (*Ep.* iii, 5;) and Nepos says of Atticus, that he never took his meals without having some reading going on. The poet Martial complains of some who used to invite him to dine, and then bored him with their bad comedies, (iii, 50.)

Slaves were frequently employed as copyists, and brought much gain to their masters by copying books. Atticus employed a number of his in copying manuscripts for sale. Crassus acquired a large part of his immense wealth by having slaves trained and educated for different professions. Such slaves were often sold for large sums; thus while a common labourer was bought for less than a hundred dollars, thousands were paid for an accomplished grammarian,* a successful actor, or a good librarian.

At the banquets of the wealthy Romans every resource was tried to add to the pleasure of the entertainment. The table was spread with a lavish luxury that has no parallel in modern times. For the amusement of the guests, musicians, and sometimes dancers, were introduced. Among the Greeks the host would have been thought inferior in accomplishments if he could not take part in those arts which graced their festal banquets. Epaminondas was distinguished as a singer and player on the harp; Pelopidas was an elegant dancer and a skilful musician. The Roman, while he imitated the Greeks in having music and dancing at his feasts, did so, as a late reviewer† says, in the spirit of Lord Chesterfield's instruction to his son:—"If you are fond of music, it is all well; get a Frenchman or Italian to twang and whistle to you; but never let me see you

---

* One Sabinus, according to Seneca, paid about five thousand dollars for a literary slave.

† London Qr., vol. lxxix.

with a pipe in your mouth, or a fiddle under your chin." So the wealthy Roman kept among his slaves skilful artists for the gratification of his guests. Frequent mention is made of the *symphoniaci*, the corps of household musicians; so that we infer they were kept in many families. In the later and more degenerate days of the Roman state, mountebanks, mimes, and other similar classes are mentioned, as exhibiting their skill at private entertainments. As the savage ferocity of the Romans introduced gladiatorial contests at their banquets, some masters had their slaves trained for these contests, and let them out both for public and private exhibition.

There were also deformed and idiotic slaves, who were highly prized by the perverse taste of some masters. The more stupid such were, the higher price they brought. A good fool was considered cheap at eight hundred dollars. Fancy prices were often paid for them. Martial[*] describes one with sharp head and long ears, which he moved like an ass. Seneca, speaking of there being a female slave, a fool, in his family, declares that he is very averse to such a vitiated taste; "for if I ever wish," he says, "to be amused with a fool, I do not have to seek far—I laugh at myself."[†] Of course, it was not even in every great house that all these different classes of slaves were. And yet on some estates the number was so great that they had to be classified. Many of these slaves were kept for show. We infer from Horace that it was customary for the rich in their walks to be attended by a large retinue. He[‡] speaks of one who often had two hundred, and often only ten slaves to accompany him. He ridicules the prætor Tullius for being attended by only five slaves in going from his villa to Rome.

It is impossible to estimate the number of slaves in Italy or Rome at any given period. Some wealthy Romans are said to have had ten or even twenty thousand. The slaves of Crassus formed a large part of his fortune. He had more than five hundred architects and masons. Scaurus had about four thousand domestics, and as many field-slaves. During the civil wars, a freedman of Augustus, who had sustained great losses, left more than four thousand slaves, besides other property.

The numerous wars of Rome kept up an abundant supply for her market. Wars were carried on in ancient times with extreme cruelty, and by the common law of nations the vanquished was consid-

---

[*] Epig. vi, 39. "Hunc vero acuto capite et auribus longis
Quæ sic moventur, ut solent asellorum."

[†] Ep. 1. "Si quando fatuo delectari volo, non est mihi longe quærendum; me rideo."

[‡] Sat. i, 3.

ered to have forfeited his life by his ill-success. If his life was spared he became the property of his conqueror. Prisoners were generally sold as soon as possible after the battle in which they were taken, for the slave-dealers usually followed in the train of the army. After the fall of the Samnites at Aquilonia, thirty-six thousand prisoners were sold. In the first Punic war, in the descent of the Romans on the African coast, twenty thousand prisoners were taken and sold. In the great victory of Marius over the Cimbri, sixty thousand were captured. Augustus, having overcome the Salassi, sold thirty-six thousand as slaves. Cæsar in his Gallic wars, is said to have taken over four hundred thousand prisoners, large numbers of whom were brought to Rome as slaves. Cicero, in the petty wars in which he was engaged, sold captives enough to amount to half a million of dollars.

Many slaves were acquired by commerce. We find early mention of the slave-trade in Africa. The Carthaginians[*] drove a brisk traffic in slaves, not only for home use, but also for exportation to foreign markets. These came from the interior of Africa, where kidnapping was extensively carried on by the petty chiefs. Negroes were considered somewhat an article of luxury at Rome, and commanded a fancy price. The satirists Juvenal[†] and Martial both allude to them.

The island of Delos was a large slave-market. It had its slave prisons, chains, and all the appliances for carrying on an extensive traffic. It is said that the sales would sometimes amount to ten thousand in a single day. Cilicia, Pamphylia, and Syria supplied it. Corinth was for a long time the great slave-mart of Greece; and from its commercial relations with Brundusium and the other seaports of Italy, it doubtless supplied the Romans with many slaves. Timæus tells us that Corinth had at one time four hundred and sixty thousand slaves.

The profits of the slave-dealers were enormous, but the business was always considered disreputable. In the camp of Lucullus captives were sold as low as about sixty-five cents a head, while the price of a common labourer at Rome was from seventy-five to one hundred and fifty dollars. The price of artisans, and such as possessed extraordinary acquirements, was often very great. Seneca[‡] speaks of a pretender to literature, who had a number of learned

[*] Cum obsidibus Carthaginiensium magna vis servorum erat.—*Livy*, xxxii, 26.

[†] Tibi pocula cursor
Gaetulus dabit aut nigri manus ossea Mauri.—*Sat.* v, 52.

[‡] Epist. xxvii.

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

slaves, for each of whom he had given nearly four thousand dollars. Suetonius* says Julius Cæsar gave extravagant prices for some of the slaves of his household; so extravagant that he was ashamed to acknowledge the amount. Juvenal† alludes to enormous sums paid for beautiful slaves. Martial‡ speaks of about four thousand dollars as being asked for a beautiful boy.

Only the cheaper kind of slaves were exposed in the market and publicly sold. They were stripped and placed on a wooden platform, so that every one could see and touch them. Martial§ describes a scene where the auctioneer frequently kisses the girl that is for sale, as an incentive for purchasers to buy. Each slave bore a tablet on his neck, on which were inscribed his name, his good and bad qualities. According to the Roman law the seller was bound to tell the faults of the slave he sold. To this Cicero|| alludes.

The more beautiful and expensive slaves were not thus publicly exposed, but were sold in the shops by private contract. We infer from what Martial¶ says, that some were in the habit of going round to these private slave-markets to merely look at the beautiful slaves. The extent to which such slaves were furnished for the vilest purposes can hardly be conceived of in modern times.

With all the evils of the system of Roman slavery, there was much hope to the slave of escape from his thraldom, for slaves were frequently emancipated, sometimes during the life of the master, and often by will. In some instances the emancipation was absolute, and at other times some conditions were imposed.

The manumission of slaves was of different kinds, and attended with certain legal forms.

What was called *manumissio vindicta*, was when the master appeared with the slave before the prætor or one of the higher magistrates, and a third person, in later times always a lictor, by an outward sign divested the master of all power over the slave. The lictor placing a little staff upon the head of the slave, pronounced the words, "Now I say that you are a free man." The master then took hold of the slave, and turning him round said, "I wish this man to be free." The magistrate sanctioned the declaration of the lictor, and formally announced that the ceremony was complete; after which the master and others present congratulated the new freedman in words we often meet with in Plautus and Terence, "I rejoice that you are free." It is probable that the grounds of manumission were given to the court, and put upon record; for this became necessary when limitations to the right were introduced. This *manu-*

---

* Julius, 47. † Sat. v, 55. ‡ Epig. i, 59. § Epig. vi, 66. || De Offic. iii, 17.
¶ Epig. ix, 60.

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

missio vindicta may be justly considered the oldest form. Vindicius,* who made known the conspiracy for the restoration of the Tarquins, is mentioned as having been freed in this way.

In the act called *manumissio censu*, the master had the name of the slave entered at once in the list of the censors as a free citizen. This took for granted that the slave had acquired from his earnings sufficient private property, or that the master gave him some fortune with his freedom. The simple entering of the name of the slave in the censor's list was all that was necessary to make this emancipation valid in the eye of the law.

Another kind was called *manumissio testamento*, manumission by will. It is evident that this was practised in early times, for it is mentioned in the laws of the Twelve Tables. The slave was either freed directly by an express clause of the will, or it was left to the heir to effect the emancipation. Sometimes conditions were annexed, as the payment of a certain sum to the heir; the lighting a lamp in connexion with solemn rites at the tomb of the deceased master; serving the heir during youth, or for a number of years.

There were also cases of informal manumission, as when the master declared his willingness that the slave should be free, without the regular forms of the law. Such still remained subject to the legal disabilities of slaves, though they could not be held in actual slavery, for the prætor would protect them against any attempt to reduce them to their former condition.

The emancipated slave received a name which marked him as a Roman citizen. He also assumed the *toga*, the dress of the freeborn Roman. Though legally and practically free, he still retained a relation of dependence to his former master. He was obliged to observe a respectful demeanour toward him, to assist him in misfortune, and not sue him at law. It is not, however, clear that the freedman, during the time of the republic, was liable to punishment if he conducted himself ungratefully toward his former master. But in later times, freedmen who had grossly violated their obligations to their patrons, might be punished, and in aggravated cases reduced again to slavery. Even earlier we read of scenes which show that the patrician demanded respect and attention from the freedmen. On one occasion, when the crowd in the forum by their clamours were interrupting Scipio Æmilianus, unable to endure their insolence, he cried out, "Silence, spurious sons of Italy." And again, "Ay, clamour as ye will; ye whom I brought bound to Rome will never make me fear, unbound though ye be now." "The silence," says the historian,† "by which this terrible denunciation

---

* Livy, book ii, 5.

† Michelet, History of Roman Republic, p. 217.

was followed, proves that the freedmen feared lest, descending from the rostrum, the conqueror of Carthage and Numantia should recognise his African or Spanish captives, and discover under the toga the marks of the whip."

Freedmen who had acquired wealth would often assume an air of consequence, and a style of living offensive to the Roman aristocracy. The shafts of the satirists are often aimed at these upstarts, who would look down upon the freeborn Roman. Horace, himself the son of a freedman, breaks out* in a strain of bitter invective at the presumption of a freedman who, insolent from his wealth and station, had taken his seat at the theatre in the place assigned for the nobility.

As there had been abuses connected with the exercise of the right of emancipation, the Roman law provided for its limitation. The slave had sometimes been emancipated for the sake of shielding him from judicial investigation and punishment. Some masters emancipated their slaves to secure the public gift of gain, a part of which the freedman was to return to his former master. Sulla selected ten thousand slaves, and gave them both their freedom and the right of suffrage, to secure for himself personal influence and safety.

It was at first provided by law that no slave who had been subjected to disgraceful legal punishment could obtain the privilege of citizenship. He could only secure such civil rights as were conceded to foreigners. It was afterward decided that only a certain proportion of the slaves of one master should be manumitted. Where the master held only one or two slaves, the law made no provision. Between three and ten only one-half could be emancipated; of any number under thirty one-third; under one hundred one-fourth; under five hundred one-fifth; and in no case whatever could a master emancipate more than one hundred.

Sometimes the state granted liberty to the slave when he had performed some act of public benefit. Livy† mentions that thirteen slaves were emancipated for saving the temple of Vesta. Slaves were also emancipated for giving information against criminals—sometimes receiving their liberty for this very purpose.

Any sketch of Roman slavery would be incomplete if it failed to notice the servile insurrections. It is not to be supposed that these large masses of men, in many respects fully equal to their masters, could be kept from knowing their own strength. Many Roman slaveholders lived in dread of the horrors of a servile war and of the terrible retribution which might await them. It was at one time

---

* Epode iv.

† Book xxvi, c. 27.

proposed in the senate that the slaves should wear a distinctive dress; but the proposal was rejected, for it was not thought safe to let them know their own number. The danger of revolt was lessened from the close supervision under which the slaves were kept, and from the almost utter impossibility of harmony of action among them. The fact that so many were emancipated, and that all were eligible to the rights and privileges of the free, enabled the most intelligent to bide their time patiently. Yet there were several insurrections of the slaves that for a while menaced the very existence of Rome. As early as 458 B. C., Appius Herdonius, a Sabine, raised the standard of revolt, and called upon the slaves to break their oppressive yoke.* With Appius was a band of four thousand exiles and runaway slaves who by night had taken possession of the capitol. He proclaimed freedom to the slaves who should join him. His offer met with but little response, and after holding the capitol for a few days, he and his followers were routed and nearly all slain. Still later we read of a conspiracy of the slaves† to set the city on fire in different places.

In the year 196 B. C. Etruria was threatened with a fearful insurrection. In quelling it "many," says Livy, "were slain, many captured, and the leaders after being scourged were crucified."

One of the most formidable insurrections was that of the slaves of Sicily, 135 B. C. Sicily was divided at that time into large plantations, which were almost entirely cultivated by slaves. The cruelty of their overseers, and the hope of liberty, bound them together, though differing in language and habits. Eunus, their leader, pretended to have a revelation from heaven, and held the degraded bondmen under his control by the powerful influence of superstition. He kept the field for six months with seventy thousand troops, though large forces were brought against him. During this insurrection something like courts of justice were established, where the slave might arraign his master, and, recounting his cruelties, secure retributive vengeance. After the contest had been carried on for years, Roman discipline at length prevailed, and twenty thousand slaves fell in their last battle.

There were many other insurrections, both in Sicily and Italy. But the most important was the servile war, which occurred in the time of Pompey and Crassus, a few years before the birth of Christ. A large body of gladiators was kept at Capua by Lentulus Batiatus, to be let out for public festivals. Seventy-eight of them escaped from their barracks, and seizing on such arms as were at hand, they overpowered an escort having a large number of gladiatorial weapons. They took up their quarters in the then extinct crater of Mount

---

° Livy, book iii, c. 15.

† Livy, book iv, c. 45.

[illegible]

[illegible]

Vesuvius. They chose for their leader Spartacus, a Thracian by birth, a man of courage and genius.

The insurgents were victorious in several engagements with the regular troops, and from them obtained a supply of arms. Spartacus proclaimed the freedom of the slaves, and great numbers joined him from all parts of southern Italy. The number of his troops at one time amounted to one hundred thousand men. The war was carried on as servile wars usually are—with great barbarity on both sides. Three prætors and two consular armies were completely defeated. Several of the principal cities of Campania were taken and plundered. The insurgents possessed large establishments for the manufacture of arms; and such was their strength, that had it not been for dissensions among themselves, they might have consummated the plan of their leader, escaped from Italy and settled in colonies beyond the Alps. They were finally conquered by Crassus; and are said to have lost one hundred and five thousand men during the course of the war. The dead bodies of the defeated insurgents were impaled all along the high road from Capua to Rome. The ravages of this war were so great that Italy can hardly be said to have recovered from its effects during the time of the emperors. The free population was almost entirely extirpated, and the region divided into large estates which mainly served for pasturage.

The evil effects of this gigantic system of slavery were gradually developing themselves. Rome, it is true, was extending her dominion over the world, but a fatal disease was at her very heart. She sent her own freeborn sons to fight and to die on foreign soil, while she was bringing to Italy millions of slaves to till the large estates of her nobles, and to minister to the vices of her dissolute rulers. But the system was gradually working its own ruin, and with it the ruin of the empire. Slavery made labour disreputable. Slaves occupied the positions and were engaged in the pursuits which might have furnished employment for the poor common people. Almost the only occupation left for the poor Roman was agriculture; and from this he was finally driven by the competition of the wealthy landholder, who cultivated his estate by the unpaid labour of slaves. After his little farm had been added to the large estate of the wealthy capitalist, the poor, but freeborn Roman lounged about the capital, feeding upon the bounty of his patron, or supported at the public cost,* content if his daily wants were supplied, and his fierce passions gratified by the shows of wild beasts and gladiators.

---

* When Cæsar assumed the command at Rome, he found three hundred and twenty thousand persons receiving corn from the state. He left one hundred and fifty thousand.

> "A large portion of the urban population, whom the nobles systematically debauched, were no better than a needy rabble, dissolute in morals, and destitute of any sense of national honor. The ready market offered for their votes was attractive to the lowest and vilest of the Italians; and the mob of the comitia was swelled by the worst class of the new citizens. Too proud to work, where labour was the mark of the slave, a multitude of freemen, steeped in the lowest poverty, found a bare subsistence in their idleness from this annual sale of their highest privilege, and presented ready instruments for any political adventurer who promised either present pay or prospective rapine."*

Deep was the degradation of the slave, but that of the poor citizen at last became deeper. Through all classes of society the purity of ancient manners had become changed to open dissoluteness. The standard of morals had become low; the marriage tie lost its binding force; and women of rank, says Seneca, counted years, not by the number of consuls, but by the number of their husbands. The evils of slavery affected every class of society; but especially did it tend to crush lower and lower the free labourer, till it made him the idler about the forum, living upon the sale of his vote.

There had been from the earliest times at Rome mutual jealousy and animosity between the noble and the plebeian, between the rich and the poor. Slavery tended to make a wider separation. It left Rome no large middle class—the "solid men," who weigh carefully their own interests and the well-being of the state, before they disturb the existing forms of government. What Rome needed was the large class of mechanics, of tradesmen, of manufacturers, of teachers, of physicians; in fine, of men all through the trades and professions, enjoying the rights of citizens. But all these places were filled by slaves; and the separation between the two divisions of the people at Rome became wider and wider.

It was this system of slavery that more than any one other cause hastened the downfall of the Roman empire. "The radical vice," says Guizot, "of the Roman society, and of every society in which slavery exists on a large scale, where the master rules over a troop of slaves, is the same. In all countries, in all times, under every form of polity, after an interval more or less long, by the effect alone of the enjoyment of power, of intellectual development, and of all social advantages, the superior class end in becoming weak and effeminate." This was most clearly seen in the history of Rome; for, from the time of the civil wars, slavery went on slowly maturing her ruin. It impoverished the land, so that Rome was dependent on the granaries of Africa for her bread. It increased dissoluteness and the most loathsome forms of vice, as may be seen in the pages of her own satirists; so that her own sons were degraded

---

* Merivale, History of the Romans under the Empire, vol. i, p. 49.

below the slave. Rome fell not because the northern tribes poured their barbarian hordes into the plains of Italy, but because the manliness of the old Roman was gone, and a degenerate race were holding the reins of government. And were there through the history of Rome no opponents of such a system? Were there no philanthropists whose hearts moved in pity to the poor bondsmen? Were there no far-seeing statesmen who could behold the impending ruin of their country? Were there no patriots who, seeing the corrupting influence of slavery, were ready to suggest a remedy? It seems to have been taken for granted that slavery must exist; yet some saw its tendency, and attempted to avert its dangers. The Gracchi, in their purpose to divide the public lands among the poor citizens, hoped to establish a yeomanry, who should till the soil, and serve as a wholesome check upon the wealthy aristocracy. They also designed that the amount of land to be held by any one family should be limited, so that all the landed estates of Italy might not be in the hands of a few. The Gracchi were unsuccessful, and great injustice has been done to their names. They were not rash innovators, but men of large views; and had their plans been carried out, slavery would not so soon have made free labour disreputable, nor so soon have made fertile Italy an unproductive waste.

Without doubt, the far-seeing and comprehensive mind of Julius Cæsar perceived the danger that threatened his country from this source. But it was a gigantic evil, and could be only averted by prudent policy. Cæsar issued a decree that one-third of the labour of Italy should be performed by freemen. What would have been the result; or what further plans he may have had to modify the system, we cannot tell; for he was assassinated before this decree could be carried into effect.

The system was greatly modified under the Christian emperors, and more humane laws were enacted. One provided against the separation of families. The church was a sanctuary for the slave of a cruel master, and no merciless law obliged the fugitive to be surrendered. The testimony of slaves was also taken in questions affecting both themselves and their masters.

NOTE.—In preparing this article, besides the Latin authors, we have consulted Becker's Gallus oder Römische Scenen aus der Zeit Augusts; Becker's Handbuch der Römische Alterthümer; Blair's Inquiry into the State of Slavery among the Romans; Wallon's Histoire de L'Esclavage dans L'Antiquité; and a valuable Essay in the Biblical Repository, vol. vi, by the late Professor B. B. Edwards.

ART. VII.—HASE'S CHURCH HISTORY.

A History of the Christian Church, by Dr. CHARLES HASE, Professor of Theology in the University of Jena. Translated from the seventh and much improved German edition, by CHARLES E. BLUMENTHAL, Professor of Hebrew and Modern Languages, Dickinson College, and CONWAY P. WING, Pastor of the First Presbyterian Church, Carlisle, Pa. New-York: D. Appleton & Co.; 8vo, pp. 720. 1855.

EVERY age of the world is characterized not only by diversities, but by contrarieties; and of these we refer not so much to outward appearances, to the mechanical arrangements and superficial relations of society, as to the inward forces which make up the real life of the world, and which, by their working, give shape to history. Conservatism and radicalism are opposite forces, omnipresent in the history of man, struggling, whether in one mind or in many, through periods of greater or less length, according to the stimulus of the times and the material to be wrought, till, having made the circuit of a nation or of an empire, and having concentrated the strength of opposition on one or a few issues, they fairly meet and fight for the mastery. These decisive contests form crises of development and make eras in history. Spiritualism and materialism are two other tendencies of equal prevalence with the former, and often in close relations with them, but never of necessity coincident; *i. e.*, either of the former may be united with and pervaded by either of the latter, according to the *animus* of that period which, at any point in history, is the past. If that period was spiritualistic, then conservatism will be spiritualistic, and radicalism materialistic; and, *mutatis mutandis*, the reverse will take place.

These several forces are now at work upon a grand scale throughout the civilized world. And, in proportion to the greater extent and elevation of the stage of action, compared with that of preceding ages, will be the greater violence of the contest, and the greater import of the decision. Modern civilization, like everything else, though radical in reference to that which preceded it, is very conservative of itself; and, though embracing more of the globe than any previous form of civilization, it is second to none in the unity of spirit pervading the whole. Its material conquests have been made tributary to harmony of feeling among the nations.

A happy consequence of this is, that nations become *complementary* to one another, not only in commerce and politics, but, what is of greater moment, in intellectual and moral culture. It is a witty,

but likewise philosophic, saying of Jean Paul, "that Providence has given to the French the empire of the land, to the English the empire of the sea, and to the Germans the empire of the air." These three forms of matter are strikingly symbolical of the distinctive characteristics of the three peoples. The land is a fair type of the materialism of the French mind, which prefers the domain of natural science; water, of the restless activity and yet conservative practicality of the English mind, which represents itself in political science and ecclesiastical polity; and air, of the spiritualism and subjectivity of the German mind, which finds its element in speculative philosophy and theology. With these three nations, combining their peculiarities, modern civilization is complete in its endowment of forces, and tends mightily toward perfection. It remains to be seen whether America, bringing them all together on a single arena, will raise civilization to its highest point. It cannot be doubted that the deep thinkers and universal scholars of Germany are now fulfilling a high mission in counteracting and neutralizing the materialism of the age. Religion is an active constituent of the German mind. Nowhere on the globe has Christianity a stronger hold than in the land of the Reformation, and almost nowhere else does it enlist a genuine *scientific* interest. All Church histories, for example, of permanent scientific value, have proceeded from German sources. The perfection of the method of history, now so fully recognised by the scientific world, itself a product of the German mind, has been as nearly attained in the late Church histories of Germany as in any existing historical works. The fruit of this must be the possession on the part of the Church of a clearer consciousness of her real constitution and of her appointed mission.

The flourishing period of Church history still in progress was inaugurated by Mosheim in his "Institutes of Ecclesiastical History," a work of unparalleled excellence at the time of its appearance, but in philosophic character vastly below the great works in the same department which have since appeared—such as Neander's "History of the Christian Religion and Church," Guericke's "Handbook of Universal Church History," Gieseler's "Compendium of Ecclesiastical History," and the works of Niedner, Gfrörer and Hase. To this list should be added, Schaff's "History of the Apostolic Church," an admirable work in itself, and forming an introduction to a promised History of the Church down to the present time. For its philosophical character, the work of the Roman Catholic historian, Möhler, is likewise worthy of mention. These are the prominent *universal* histories of the Church. Those confined to certain periods, or embracing only limited subjects,

such as doctrine, or a particular doctrine, polity, art, &c., &c., are almost innumerable, and are the best proofs of the intense interest felt in this particular kind of history.

The translation into English of the work named at the head of this article is a boon to American students who are not masters of the German language, inasmuch as it contains a vast amount of knowledge compressed with wonderful skill into a small compass, and so gracefully presented, even with all the encumbrance of dates and divisions, as positively to forbid weariness on the reader's part. There is no manual extant in the English language worthy to be compared, in point of scientific character, with the one before us. The translation of such a book into good readable English was no easy task; but Messrs. Blumenthal and Wing have accomplished it. Their version of Hase is not only faithful, but with few exceptions neat and fluent, and revealing to our eyes, in a pretty faithful reading, very few grammatical errors or inelegancies of diction. The merits of the book will be made to appear more particularly as we proceed in the application of general principles.

The true idea of Church history cannot be attained until we have analyzed the two ideas associated in it—that of History, and that of the Church.

1. *The Idea of History.* Like everything else, history may have an objective and a subjective definition, according as we view it in its own constitution merely in relation to other things also objective; or, in its relation to the mind which apprehends it, and in the properties through which it is manifested to that mind. Objectively, a tree is composed of root, trunk, branches, leaves, flower and fruit; subjectively, it is a plant with a woody stem, having branches, &c.,—when of a small size called a shrub, when of a larger size called a tree, *par excellence.* In the former case, it is considered simply as to its material forms; in the latter, as to those forms apprehended by the mind, in giving it a classification among the varieties of the vegetable kingdom. Again, a government is, on the one hand, an aggregation of offices, in a certain place, and at a certain time, among a certain people; on the other hand, it is a particular form of authority, animated by a particular spirit, derived from a certain origin, and working out certain results. So history is, objectively, the collective whole of the facts that have transpired in the world; and, subjectively, it is the scientific apprehension by the historian of events in their true relations. This apprehension itself is true, in proportion as it recognises, under the actual conditions of time and space, and in their true relations, the two great factors of history, God and Man.

2. *The Idea of the Church.* Of this, as in the former case, there are two views, regarding it either as an organization of certain parts and a certain operation, or as a form of humanity apprehended in its genesis, growth and tendencies. Several closely related definitions may be given, as we view the Church in connexion with our Lord Jesus Christ, who is its living head; or in reference to believers who are its constituent parts, and who are human beings born again into a new life. In the former view the Church is either (*a*) "the kingdom of Christ," of which he spake when he said, "My kingdom is not of this world," and as such setting forth, in particular, the *authority* of Him who has "delivered us from the power of darkness;" or, (*b*,) "the body of Christ," according to the words of the apostle, "We are members of his body," and again, "He is the head of the body, the Church;" and, as such, giving form to the doctrine of the *life-union* between the Redeemer and those who believe on him. In the latter view, the Church is either (*c*) the communion (*κοινωνία*) of the faithful,—"so we being many are one body in Christ, and every one members one of another,"—standing in genetic relationship to the definition (*b*;) or (*d*) it is a pædagogic institution, a combination of means for training believers in the present state of conflict as preparatory to a coming state of triumph and glory, and as such "the militant Church," and standing in genetic relationship to definition (*a*).

Now among these conceptions there ought to be found one capable of comprehending in itself all that is essential to the others. That one is the definition (*b*) above. For, as the head controls the natural body, so does Christ, the spiritual head of his people, govern them; and herein is supplied the idea of the "kingdom." And as the members of the natural body are so intimately connected as to feel in common whatever is pleasant or painful to sense, so will the members of Christ's spiritual body be pervaded by a sympathy that acts with the quickness and the power of instinct. As to the *discipline* of the members of "Christ's body," this is secured in the authority of the head. Therefore, all that is essential to the idea of the Church is comprised in the phrase "body of Christ." This conception, furthermore, is the only one which comports fully with the significance of the sacraments, (and particularly of the eucharist,) which are essential to the formal constitution of the Church. Therefore the Church is to be conceived of as something *organic*, and susceptible of growth, being neither, on the one hand, a loose aggregation of parts without affinity, nor, on the other hand, a fixed and hardened mass, incapable of development.

Church history is, therefore, objectively, the course of events that

have taken place in the progressive development of "the body" of our Lord Jesus Christ; the onward movements of the Christian life in its various normal types, offset with the abnormal workings of heresy and schism; and subjectively, it is that development conceived and represented by the historian in such order as shows the true relations of sequence and the real character of the Church in its successive periods.

The following extract will show the reader Dr. Hase's highly scientific conception of Church history:—

> "The Church is always in a progressive state, i. e., it is striving to be a *perpetual manifestation of the life of Christ in humanity.* In other words, it is always aiming to exhibit his life more and more perfectly, and on a more extensive scale, sometimes in conflict and sometimes in connexion with the world. *Church history* is a representation of the Church in this progressive state by an exhibition of the facts which have occurred in its course. In its scientific form it is the combination of all those individual elements which have had any influence upon its composition, since it is, (1) *critically*, an impartial, honest and strict inquiry into facts, and into the extent of the confidence which can be reposed in their proofs, so that, where certainty cannot be attained, a knowledge of this extent in its different degrees may determine the scientific character of the narrative; (2) *genetically*, a statement of the facts in connexion with their causes, taking care, however, that no explanations are given inconsistent with the proper nature of the idea developed in the events, or with the peculiar character of the active agents in them; (3) *theologically*, an estimation of the facts in their precise relation to the religious spirit, allowing no preconceived opinions to determine what has actually occurred, but only to assist in understanding them as we find them."—*Introd.*, § 2.

A work of this kind should be characterized by the utmost precision of statement and definition; and so is Dr. Hase's book in the main. But the words italicised in the following quotation from § 1, convey an implication which we presume the author would not maintain, and which possibly escaped his notice:—"The Church stands in contrast with the world when the latter is regarded as including all forms of life which are merely natural, *and not of a religious character.*" The implication, as every one must see, is not only that all religion is supernatural, but that all religion is a "manifestation of the life of Christ in humanity;" unless, indeed, the author should regard "the life of Christ" as only a particular manifestation of the religious spirit, in which case it remains, that all religion is supernatural, and that Christianity is not *essentially* distinguished from Judaism and heathenism. The term *world* should be made to include all religious life except the Christian; for although the various systems of heathenism may be attributed to a traditionary revelation of the primitive age of history, and though Judaism is based upon a historic revelation, yet no one of them, even on that ground, can claim the impartation of a *new life* to man, and therefore none of them can be a supernatural development.

We must concede to Dr. Hase a rigidly scientific conception of Church history. But, at the same time, we may be allowed to think that his views are too exclusively scientific, and his appreciation of the Church and her history too exclusively æsthetic. He does not seem to have much religious feeling, though his ecclesiastical connexions are orthodox. He appears, also, to have an ideal of culture which is largely humanistic, and conflicts somewhat with the perfect appreciation of the Christian ecclesiastical life. This is manifest in the general tone of the work. His criticism is not that of severe fault-finding, but rather of the most lively sense of the beautiful, and a keen disrelish of deformity fully capable of self-control, and showing a self-complacent smile and a gentle turn of the lip at what seems to him to smack of vulgarity, ignorance, or pretence. The book abounds in passages that show up the ludicrous side of a serious matter by a single dash of the pen, or by a mere circumstantial connexion: for instance, p. 106, "The great multitude, indeed, followed where fortune and power led the way; but Augustine found by experience, as Libanius had intimated, that it was easier to exclude the gods from the temples than from the hearts of the people, and that Jesus was not often sought for from disinterested motives." Often it is not so much what is said that produces the impression, as the tone and manner of it, as (p. 123) the remarks on Augustine's conversion, and (p. 198) the mention of the first host of crusaders.

The glimpses we get of Hase's doctrinal views indicate everywhere a deficiency of Christian feeling. Speaking of the edict of the apostolic council, (Acts,) he says: "This proceeding could not be reconciled with the original covenant, (Gal. ii, 1,) without considerable ingenuity of reasoning, and was not very consistent with the course which Paul sometimes pursued; but it was a well-intended scheme to harmonize those conflicting tendencies which were just springing up in the Church, and of which tradition gives us an account." We forbear remark upon this further than to say, that, if the circumcision of Timothy be the particular act of Paul, which seems to Dr. Hase inconsistent with the decree that he and Barnabas obtained from the council, the fact that one of Timothy's parents was of the Jewish nation, made an important difference between his case and that of persons of purely Gentile origin. The whole passage indicates a cool presumption, in the treatment of what Christians usually recognise as divine and infallible, that is scarcely consistent with deep piety.

That Dr. Hase has, however, in general, a lively appreciation of the good and the great, is readily conceded; it is abundantly

exemplified in this work. The book is not defective in scientific conception, nor in artistic finish, but in *the Christian spirit;* and this is a defect of so radical a kind as to affect not a little the execution of the scientific conception. Had Dr. Hase some of the orthodox straitness of Guericke, and above all the tender, heavenly piety of Neander, this manual would have been as nearly perfect as human works may be. Dr. Schaff beautifully remarks of Hase's book:—"All the more is it to be regretted, that we miss from this edifice of Gothic beauty the heaven-pointing tower, and the holy sign of the cross."

The *idea* of Church history being once established, the next step is to inquire into its *method.* Method includes both principle and plan; the rule by which the artist works in the effort to realize his ideal, and the scheme which he draws for himself as the embodiment of his rule and the outline of his picture. Every military general has his *method* of warfare. His ideal to be realized is victory: his rule is either stratagem or force, or both; his plan is the division of the field and the order of his troops. The orator aims at success in winning the minds of the multitude; his rule is conviction by argument, or persuasion by motives, or capture by enthusiasm; or, it may be, all of these combined; his plan is the order of times and circumstances, and the array of arguments, motives, or tragic displays of passion. The historian likewise has his rule and plan for actualizing his ideal, which is history in some form of conception. If his conception is of mere facts in the concrete, then his rule is narrative, and his plan *chronicle* and incident. If his conception is of facts as the exponents of the human mind, then his rule is pragmatical composition, and his plan is a psychological accounting for facts, with more or less reference to time and place, as well as the mental crises of the ages. But if his conception is of facts as the joint products of God and man acting in the same line of direction, with whatever difference of intention, then his rule is philosophic construction, and his plan the unity of human development, with due regard to great epochs and revolutions. This last is the highest view of history and the glory of the present age. Struck out with great originality by the wonderful mind of Herder, this theory was brought to its greatest completeness by Hegel, in whose hands however it was misused, because of his one-sided philosophical doctrine. But in this view alone does history attain its proper unity, and that scientific character which makes it worthy of a prominent place among liberal studies. And, what is more important, this mode of treatment alone brings all history into its legitimate connexion with theology, the highest

of sciences, and brings into a strong light the bearing of time upon eternity.

Now in the department of Church History we find a development of humanity produced by the operation of *divine influences* ever at work with less or greater prevalence and intensity throughout the body in general and its members in particular. The history of the Church is something supernatural. Therefore in treating it we are to recognise not only the general presence of God in the affairs of men, but also the particular presence and agency of Christ and the Holy Ghost in the Church. "*There* God acts as Creator, Preserver, and Ruler of the world, and man in his natural, fallen state: *here* God manifests himself as the Saviour and Sanctifier of the world, and man comes into view as an object of redeeming love and as a member of the kingdom of grace. Secular history is the theatre of Elohim, or God under his general character, as Father of Gentiles as well as Jews. Sacred history, and its continuation Church history, is the sanctuary of Jehovah, the God of the covenant, the Lord of a chosen people."—*Schaff's Hist. Ap. Ch. Introd.*, p. 5.

All the earlier Church histories, such as those of Eusebius, Theodoret, Evagrius, Sozomen, and Socrates, were of the simple narrative character, and written from an apologetico-polemic point of view. And even down to Mosheim, all were prominently annalistic, and from a position more thoroughly polemic. Mosheim (Introd., § 1) aimed at a "faithful narrative of the external condition and internal state and transactions of that body of men who have borne the name of *Christians;* and in which events are so traced to their causes that the providence of God may be seen in the establishment and preservation of the Church, and the reader's piety, no less than his intelligence, be advanced by the perusal."

This indicates a high point of view compared with his predecessors. But it is evident, not only from this extract, but also from the whole work itself, that in it events are contemplated *psychologically,* and "the providence of God" is regarded more as a supervision than an agency. Later historians, with a more elevated philosophical groundwork, look every one through the medium of his own peculiar development and ecclesiastical connexion. And of this we cannot complain if the writer subordinate his bias in all cases to impartial love of truth. Dr. Hase says very truly:—

> "It is not, however, indispensable to the impartiality of the historian, that he should appear to love nothing and to hate nothing. It is only needful, first of all, that he should never place the actual facts in false positions, on account

of either preferences or aversions; and then, that he should recognise those conditions under which others have, perhaps necessarily, formed opinions and sentiments different from his own. Indeed, a Church history in which the author exhibited no distinct ecclesiastical character, and did not imprint this with clearness upon his work, would be of very little value to the Church."—*Introd.*, § 5.

But how stands our author with regard to the *doctrine of method* above delineated? He seems to us quite sound in theory, but less so in practice. He says (Introd., § 1) :—"This contrast" (that is, between the Church and the state) "is only in particular relations, since the state also is *a divine institution, and the world was created by God, and is intended to be gradually pervaded by the Church.*" This taken together with the second section, quoted above, will prove the general correctness of his theory. But the quotations and references given under our first paragraph, show how little effect the presence and agency of the Holy Ghost—a doctrine avowed in general terms in his introduction—has had upon his own mind in the composition of the history. We think, moreover, that a candid, Christian mind, will gather the impression that he forgets, as far as the nature of the subject will allow, even the *general* agency of God in history: so that, in the second division of the first period of the history of the Church, a time when controversy was waged with Judaism and heathenism, "the principles which finally obtained the ascendancy, for that reason only became those of the Catholic Church," (§ 74;) and, in the second period, the "Nicene creed is the product chiefly and almost exclusively of imperial authority," (§§ 102, 103;) and the Nestorian controversy is but little else than a "strife of mere intrigues," (§ 113.) The position from which he starts would lead us to expect a treatment of the controversies of the Church, setting forth the *divine working* in bringing to the consciousness of God's people *a clear apprehension of the fundamental doctrines of Christianity*,—a view that throws sanctity and glory around those strifes, which otherwise, from the large admixture of merely human elements, appear so lamentable, and sometimes even contemptible. But our expectation is disappointed. Human cunning, personal ambition, court policy, and reckless speculation, play before us in bald deformity. These have brewed their own storm, and no Neptune, rising from the deep, frightens the billows into rest. The carnal disciples struggle with the tempest in their own strength, and no calm voice is heard, saying, "*Peace, be still.*" What we say is particularly true of the earlier portions of the history. The author's sympathy with the first age of the Church is scarcely an assignable quantity,

and with the later ages it is only that of an artist with his picture.

We must not pass this criticism, however, without allowing that *a manual*, such as this, in which the matter is so thoroughly compressed, affords a writer less opportunity to make clear his doctrinal and philosophic views, and circumstances may almost compel him, at times, to a brevity and coolness of statement that seems like indifference to great truths. But for *this* we make no complaint. We object only, in the present work, to that which is positively *inconsistent* with the fundamental doctrines of Church history. The sum of our criticism on this head is that Dr. Hase has given us the *body* of the history of the Church with imperfect and somewhat deceptive reflections of the *soul.* His method is chiefly *external.* As to his *plan*, it is not strictly philosophic in the sense we have laid down, nor is it simply pragmatic. It would have been philosophic, if his moral and æsthetic habitudes had allowed him to fulfil his theoretic conceptions of the Church and of history. The highest demand of the philosophic treatment is that the writer, from the stand-point peculiar to this method, give himself up to his material, making it thoroughly objective, both in its outward constitution and in its animating spirit. A task so difficult is attainable by few; and while Dr. Hase comes so far short, he may justly claim a high place for what he has accomplished.

The division of the history into ages and periods will strike every one, we think, as beautiful for simplicity and precision. There is great room for diversity among writers in the minor divisions of history; and while the great eras are undisturbed, this diversity can have but little effect on the composition. We sketch the division, as follows, referring to the work (Introd., § 9) for particulars.

Age I.—Ancient Church History, A. D.	1–800.	
Period 1	1–312	Constantine.
" 2	312–800	Charles the Great.
Age II.—Mediæval Church History, A. D.	800–1517.	
Period 3	800–1216	Innocent III.
" 4	1216–1517	Martin Luther.
Age III.—Modern Church History, A. D.	1517–1853.	
Period 5	1517–1648	Peace of Westphalia.
" 6	1648–1853	Present Time.

This work is distinguished by a peculiarity which to many persons will give it a special interest; we mean the introduction of

comprehensive notices of ecclesiastical art, in the different periods after it once had an existence. No other historian of the Church has given this subject a formal treatment. It is noticed by Neander briefly, in connexion with the subject of worship. The reader will find himself both entertained and instructed by §§ 130, 267, 390 and 487. And if he has been too far swayed by the Puritanic proscription of taste in ecclesiastical building and decoration, which has generally prevailed in American churches; he may feel a new chord stirred in his heart by the contemplation of the Church as "a new temple of Solomon, a type of the earth with all its children, and the vault of heaven stretched above them;" and he may breathe a gentle sigh, in the spirit of the great Puritanic bard of a former age, for

"The storied windows richly dight,
Casting a dim, religious light."

In power of condensation Dr. Hase has few equals, and certainly none can surpass him. The following are examples taken at hazard:—

> "In England, *Dunstan*, (d. about 990,) an abbot, and a triple bishop, versed in all the knowledge prevalent in his day, so powerful that he held even the devil in his tongs, and, though personally devoted to his own visions in worldly matters, so politic that he entirely controlled three successive kings and broke the heart of another who presumed to resist him, attempted to reform the voluptuous lives of the priesthood by putting his monks in the place of those clergymen who would not give up their wives."—§ 201.
>
> "*Philip*, the youthful landgrave of Hesse, after the diet of Worms, joined the party of the Reformation, became a personal friend of Melancthon, and declared (1525) that he would rather part with his lands and subjects than to abandon the word of God. As a leader of his party he was crafty, but at the same time upright, fond of novelties, a pious Christian, a firm friend of the Bible; but either independent of the theologians, or with a singular scrupulosity bringing them to his terms; full of confidence, not only in divine aid, but in the worldly means by which a spiritual revolution was to be effected; intelligent, and in his best days powerful."—§ 322.

But we need not multiply illustrations of that marvellous skill which every section exemplifies.

Our author has also a rare skill in the graphic delineation of life and character. His pictures rise before us, not as if by magic, or by any hidden contrivance on which we dare not gaze except to dissipate the charm that spells our eyes, but as the works of a consummate artist, seated in our very presence, and bidding the obedient canvass represent the visions of his mind. The colouring is cold; but the outline is bold, the expression lively, and the action natural. In addition to the miniatures given above, the reader may refer to "The Cistercians, and St. Bernard," (§ 207,) and to the larger pictures of St. Francis of Assisi, and St. Domingo, the Castilian, (§ 265.)

We cannot withhold the following extract from the description of Francis:—

> "Whenever Francisco attempted to pronounce a studied discourse he was always confounded; but when he spoke from a sudden impulse, his spirit broke forth from the depths of his heart like a storm. Like some minnesinger he celebrated the delicious raptures of heavenly love, and the devotion of all nature for its Creator. He seems to have possessed a child-like spirit, which loved to commune with all forms of natural life, and made him salute all creatures as brethren and sisters. After many vain longings to die in proof of his love, he perceived that he was to become like the crucified Redeemer, not by a bodily martyrdom, but by the intensity of his devotion. He at last died, lying naked on the ground, in his favourite church, (Oct. 4, 1226,) with the five wounds of Christ imprinted on his body."

We have thus far endeavoured to do justice to Dr. Hase and his work, giving credit where it is due, and, we trust, finding fault only where it is just. Notwithstanding the defects of the book, we can cordially recommend it as the best compendium of the history of the Christian Church that has ever been written. We trust that it will be promptly adopted by the proper authorities as the text-book of Church-history in our "Course of Study." Indeed, it would be unjust to the young men who are coming forward in the ministry to compel them to spend their time and toil in studying the miserable compends now accessible to them, when so admirable a manual as this can be put into their hands.

We cannot conclude without expressing the hope that this work may contribute to the taste for ecclesiastical history among us. Much of the indifference to it heretofore existing is due to the imperfections of the books. But this is rapidly being obviated, and it is to be hoped that few will hereafter be found ready to charge the history of the Church with a tedious dulness, not to say a vexatious violence upon the better feelings. Among the questions of our day none can vie in importance with the question of the Church—her *unity*, and her outward relations; her ground in the past, and her hold upon the future. That the Church, as such embracing all true Christians, whether Papist or Protestant, may attain a right sense of *herself*, and be pervaded by the fulness of the glorious life that comes from her divine Head; that she may attain this, next to the immediate communion of believers with the Lord Jesus, through faith and prayer, a study of her history is necessary. Nothing would be more conservative of her present integrity, nothing more purifying to her judgment and conscience.

ART. VIII.—LETTERS ON RECENT FRENCH LITERATURE.

LETTER V.

PARIS, *May*, 1855.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE METHODIST QUARTERLY REVIEW,—Dr. Johnson used to say, with an air of national concession, that the French had, even at that day, a book upon every subject; although the Caliban of English letters would, of course, not answer for the *quality*. There was, however, at least one, and this a most important subject, on which they remained without a book till recently; so still remain, I scarce need add, the English language and no doubt all others.

Amid the vast multiplication and the fast modification of the materials and the conditions of the countless branches of human knowledge, there is nó philosophic student who has not sighed for an authentic compend of the *facts and principles, established thoroughly*, in each department, to the latest date. A compilation of this description, which, if well constructed, could afterward easily be kept up to the pace of progress in successive editions, is a necessity to general thinkers. For no one man can have a practical acquaintance with many sciences; nor can he, without such acquaintance, collect reliable materials, to say nothing of waste of time and want of libraries. It might be added, that the general thinker is, by his very constitution, precluded from particular acquaintance with the special sciences. There was, in fact, a real consequence, beneath the verbal contrariety, in the antithesis of Goldsmith's line on Burke, in the *Retaliation*:—

> "Though equal to all things, for all things unfit."

The *though* should, in philosophy, be substituted by *because;* if Burke was verily unfit for all things, taken severally and in practice, it was because of his embracing all collectively. The two faculties are quite exclusive of each other; they mark precisely what are called talent and genius.

For all these reasons, it is clearly requisite to the efficiency of genius—that is to say the great faculty of construction and of discovery—that a repertory of sound materials should be presented for its searching surveys, and be prepared for this scrutiny by the coöperation of a large variety of special hands. Hence, accordingly, the recent origin of encyclopedias, of which this has been the dim object or the vague idea. But the execution of these compilations is far from answering the purpose indicated. It is wanting in the two prime requisites of succinctness and of selection. Encyclopedias are mere physical abridgments of the libraries—compilations of detailed treatises, not of doctrines and of facts. They bring together, under one title, in a cheaper and in fewer folios, perhaps, the substance of a great multitude of distinct works; but in addition to the disadvantage of presenting it at second-hand, they give it mingled with each writer's own views, and often modified by his hypotheses, so that it still is, intellectually, as inaccessible as ever to the speculative labourer in quest of *scientific elements.*

Lord Bacon, who himself had felt the want of such a storehouse, suggests a better method of supplying it, which may be gathered from three distinct forms in which the requisite recurs to him. His "*sylva*" would, with due extension and the selections described above, respond exactly to the collection of *facts;* the "aphorisms," which he also recommends, by precept and example, correspond to the collection of *principles;* in fine, the *de augmentis scientiarum*, in its indications of the special portions of the several sciences that are completed and are defective, presents a prototype for the collection of *comments.* Those three elements, in fact, are requisite to the completeness of the repertory; for the facts should be attended by the principles received to interpret them, and both should, by the comments, be directed upon new inquiries. So admirably comprehensive was the dim conception by the great reformer of that, for want of which alone, perhaps, he failed himself of being a great discoverer. An equally gigantic intellect, but of immensely superior learning, and accordingly a great discoverer—I mean Leibnitz—erects what really is the want in question into a department of general science, in his conjectural classifications in the *Nouveaux essais sur l' entendement humain.* But these suggestions, and these samples, remained for almost two centuries without inducing even an attempt at realizing their prescriptions. At last, however, the gap is partly filled up in French literature, by a work entitled, *Universal Dictionary of Sciences, Letters, and Arts.*[*]

I say partly, for the execution falls far short of the preceding outline, as also did, indeed, the purpose of the author. His aim, he tells us, was to "compile a work which would take an intermediate position between the technical dictionaries and the encyclopedias;" which, less superficial than the former and less discursive than the latter, would present, upon each subject and with a rigorous exactness, the really indispensable notions; which at the same time would present them in the most succinct and substantial form, and which, through this brevity in the expression and a severe choice in the details, might condense these notions all in a single volume, plain to all." Thus, to purvey, not for philosophers, but for the public, was the author's project; and on the accomplishment of this alone, he should be criticized as an author. Objections to the plan itself would lie only to the private thinker, and so would travel, as the lawyers express it, beyond the record before the court.

At the same time, I repeat, this plan includes, in large part, and indeed inevitably, the great philosophic requisite described. It presents us the established laws with all the processes and technicalities in each department of science and art, explained with more or less sufficiency. The progress of discovery as of improvement in the main departments is moreover sketched historically, though quite summarily. The leading works upon every subject are also indicated in a detailed reference, which is another feature of importance to the rummager of libraries. You cannot, in America, conceive the value of this indication. But it is absolutely necessary in Paris, where you will not, at the chief library, be shown a volume of any work without detailing upon

---

[*] DICTIONNAIRE UNIVERSEL DES SCIENCES, DES LETTRES, ET DES ARTS. *Par M. M. N. Bouillet, Conseilleur honoraire de l' Universite, Inspecteur de l' Academie de Paris, &c., &c.* Paris: *Librairie de Hachette et Cie.* 1854.

paper these four preliminary specialities: The name and surnames of the author, the exact title of the book, the special form of the edition, the place and year of publication. Nor are these formalities at all superfluous, when the work is to be looked for among *fifteen hundred thousand* volumes, which the Imperial Library holds at this moment.

But the prime utility of this dictionary is general, if not quite popular. It is a hand-book for the better class of readers, and even writers, who desire at least a summary knowledge of whatever they peruse or propagate. In no department of human knowledge, human action, or human expression, can they encounter a truth, a process, or a term which is not explained there. Such, at all events, is the engagement in the preface of the work, and both the author and the place of publication are a guarantee. At Paris, the execution was, in the most eminent degree, at the same time favoured in its means and controlled in its defects. The chief director, M. Bouillet, enjoys also the public confidence for his large, long, and even learned experience. He is the author of all the articles in the work on the mental and the moral sciences. He names a number of his co-labourers, who are also mostly men of competence; as, for example, the mathematical, the physical and the chemical sciences are treated by Charles Gerhardt, the author of a work of a first-class merit upon organic chemistry.

It may be added that M. Bouillet had moreover furnished a proof of fact, as his special fitness for this description of compilation. He is the author of another publication, which forms a counterpart, entitled a "Universal Dictionary of History and of Geography," and which has reached in a few years the *ninth* edition. This work professes, as he himself has very aptly characterized it, to do for the *names* of all the personages and the localities of time and space, what the recent work proposes for the *things* of art and nature. And its great success and high repute attest the excellence of the execution.

It would be idle, then, to add my personal opinion in this current notice. It would even be presumptuous in a simple individual to sit in judgment upon a compend of all knowledges and entire nature. I may say, however, that I notice, in glancing cursorily through the book, some slight mistakes, both of omission and commission. For example, in a literature so familiar as should be the English, there occur the following, in the single article of Logic:—1. Old Watts is represented as the "classical treatise" on the subject; 2. Whateley's "quite recent" book is dated 1850—too recent by some twenty years at least, since it appeared in the Encyclopædia; 3. Mill's Logic is not mentioned at all. But such writers are notorious for the slightness of their acquaintance with foreign literature, and especially perhaps with the English. They speculate on them intelligently, because this involves only generalities. But as to details and statistics they merely *cram* for the occasion. These, however, are of prime importance in such a work as that in question. It is, therefore, to be hoped that all such blemishes as those exemplified will be excluded in the course of subsequent editions. It is just to add, that the author has the candour and good sense to invite his readers to communicate to him any deficiency or errors they may discover. I may, therefore, take the liberty of venting my surprise, that even in the former "dictionary," which I have

looked into more closely, there should remain, after nine editions in the capital of Europe, several serious omissions of both ancient and modern personages; such, for instance, as Callicratides, Hippodamus, Bryonius, Hegel, Schelling, &c.; and this, while the work is brought up, in a Supplement, to 1852.

But these are trifles in a publication of such importance and extent, which I accordingly commend without reserve to all who read the French. There is no country where such compilations would be so useful as in America. Both the works should go together, and would make a complete cyclopædia, within a compass and at a cost not, I think, previously approached. They are each composed of one thick quarto volume in double-columned pages, of which the "Dictionary of Arts and Sciences" contains some seventeen hundred and fifty; the "Dictionary of Geography and History," over two thousand. The price of both would scarce exceed, I believe, $10.

There has been still, it seems, another blank in French literature until lately, and one which may be thought more singular than the preceding. A publication, entitled the "Theology of Nature," (*Théologie de la Nature, par* HERCULE STRAUSS-DURCKEIM, *Docteur des Sciences, Paris, Victor Masson,*) proclaims itself, in terms, to be the *first* upon the subject; first, 't is true, not in France alone, but the world over. Notwithstanding the naïve unconsciousness implied in the extension, the author's statement may be credited within the limits of his own country. For even the best-informed Frenchmen, as I have hinted you above, know really little of our temporary foreign literature, especially British. They have, moreover, another weakness which is partly the cause of this "effect defective"—that of concluding that whatsoever, in philosophy or letters, has not been done in France or Paris cannot have well been done elsewhere. It was probably this French inference that led our natural theologian to overlook his predecessors, even across the British Channel, from Bishop Butler, now a century back, down to Paley and the Bridgewater Treatises. Yet the two former are, I think, translated into French.

At all events, if this be really the first original attempt in France,—and I, for my part, recollect no other, I think, besides, the fact presumable,—the contrast is a matter for explanation. The chief cause is found in the distinction of religion. France has continued formally obedient to Catholicism, which rests alone upon tradition, upon testimony. England and the other countries of the Reformation who threw off this system, could only do so by destroying the value of its evidence. But as this sacrifice impaired somewhat the basis also of revealed religion, they were obliged to supply the ruin by an appeal from man to nature, from mere testimonial evidence to natural and scientific. This supplemental and similar evidence, moreover, was demanded by this more *rational* conception of the dogmas to be proved. Hence the natural theologies and natural evidences of theology which have been treated of in most or all, perhaps, the Protestant countries; while not a treatise of the description has, I think, appeared in any of the Catholic. It may be added that the contrast presents a concise demonstration of the superior rationality or civilization of the former nations. But this conclusion, as I have intimated, cannot properly apply to France; for here the contrast, as the catholicity, has long existed in little more than form.

ART. IX.—SHORT REVIEWS AND NOTICES OF BOOKS.

> IT is of greatest concernment in the Church and commonwealth to have a vigilant eye how books demean themselves as well as men, and thereafter to confine, imprison, and do sharpest justice on them as malefactors; for books are not absolutely dead things, but do contain a potency of life in them to be as active as that soul was whose progeny they are.—MILTON.

(1.) "*Harper's Story Books*" promise well for the instruction and amusement of the young. We are pleased to see, from the first of the series, ("*Bruno, or Lessons taught by a Dog*,") that Mr. Abbott intends to admit more of the religious element directly into this series than found its way into the "Franconia Stories." The second is even better than the first. "*Willie, or The Mortgage*," is the story of a little boy, through whose good habits and principles his father was reclaimed from drunkenness, and prosperity brought back to the family. It is a good "Maine Law" tract for children. The third story, "*The Strait Gate*," is the best of the series so far. No family in which there are young children should be without this cheap and entertaining monthly story-book.

(2.) "*Follow Jesus*," (New-York: R. Carter & Brothers; 18mo., pp. 96,) is an excellent practical exposition of the duty urged in the title, by the author of the well-known tracts, "Come to Jesus," and "It is I."

(3.) "*The Epistle to the Hebrews compared with the Old Testament*." (London: Nisbet & Co., 1854; 12mo., pp. 309.) This is a sort of practical commentary upon the Hebrews, mainly made up, however, of illustrations from the Old Testament history, with lessons drawn from them. It is a very edifying and instructive book.

(4.) OF similar aim and tendency is "*Notes and Reflections on the Epistle to the Hebrews*, by ARTHUR PRIDHAM." (London: Binns & Goodwin; 12mo., pp. 338.) There is a great deal of good devotional and practical reading in this book; but it has a Calvinistic and Millenarian vein, which will detract from its general acceptance and usefulness.

(5.) FRANCIS FORRESTER, Esq., has sent us the bound volume of "*Forrester's Boys' and Girls' Magazine*," for the year 1854, (Boston: F. & G. C. Rand,) and we cordially recommend all our friends who wish to provide a monthly magazine for their children, in which they will find abundant amusement and instruction, without anything calculated to injure either their morals or their taste, to send on their names to the publisher.

(6.) "*Primary Class-book of Botany*, by FRANCES H. GREEN." (New-York: D. Appleton & Co., 1855; 4to., pp. 102.) This neat volume is

designed for use both in schools and families, and contains a good view of the elements of vegetable structure and of the physiology of plants. It is amply illustrated.

(7.) "*Cornell's Primary Geography*" (New-York : D. Appleton & Co.; square 8vo.) is certainly the best book for beginners in geography that has ever come under our notice. It omits all abstruse terms, gives maps, &c., covering precisely the ground illustrated in the lessons, and no more; and is amply furnished with questions for exercise and review.

(8.) THE "*Ladies' Repository*" (January to June, 1855. Cincinnati: Swormstedt & Poe; New-York: Carlton & Phillips) opens its new year with new type, new features, and new promises of excellence. Each of its editors seems to have surpassed his predecessor; only, however, by standing upon his shoulders: and Dr. Clark has certainly made the Repository go beyond its former excellent self in all the qualities which should go to the making up of such a magazine. It has a sure, because well-deserved hold upon popular favour. Religious without cant, learned without pedantry, tasteful without affectation, the "Repository" is a model magazine for ladies, and deserves a place in every Christian dwelling.

(9.) "*Oscar: or, The Boy who had his own Way*," (Boston: Gould & Lincoln, 1855; 18mo.,) is a very good story for boys, illustrating the evil consequences of disobedience to parents and teachers. Like "Clinton," by the same author, it is disfigured by ungrammatical and provincial expressions. We should be sorry to have our children inoculated with such diseases as "a real bad cold" or a "lung fever," so as to be compelled to "lay abed." Such defects are worse in children's books than in any others.

(10.) WE have received the eighth, ninth, and tenth numbers of "*Harper's Gazetteer of the World*," completing the work, which contains one thousand nine hundred and fifty-two closely-printed pages in double columns. It embraces, within the compass of a single massive volume, "a much greater number of names than any gazetteer now in existence," giving the latest and most reliable statistics of agriculture, commerce, population, &c. The most important facts of the latest *censuses* taken throughout the world are incorporated into the work. The basis of the book is "Johnson's General Gazetteer of the World"—one of the most complete ever published in Europe; and the labours of Mr. Smith, the American editor, have been principally devoted to that part of the work which covers the western hemisphere. It is with such a book as with the latest almanac—everybody that *can* must buy it.

(11.) "*The Religious Denominations in the United States: their History, Doctrine, Government, and Statistics*, by JOSEPH BELCHER, D. D." (Philadelphia: J. E. Potter, 1854; 8vo., pp. 1024.) This work contains a large

amount of information; and the editor has evidently sought to make his statements with regard to the different divisions of the Church both truthful and impartial. The work is adapted rather for general circulation than for the use of scholars; and in this view we may excuse its want of method and condensation: but we can imagine *no* excuse for the horrid wood-cuts with which it is *embellished!*

* * *

(12.) "*The Truth and Life; Twenty-two Sermons*, by the Rt. Rev. C. P. M'Ilvaine, D. D." (New-York: R. Carter & Brothers, 1855; 8vo., pp. 508.) This is in many respects one of the most valuable of the many volumes that Bishop M'Ilvaine has written. The sermons are generally clear expositions of Bible doctrine, or fervent exhortations to Christian practice. They do not, indeed, belong to the class of brilliant discourses; a class which might well be spared from the stores of Christian literature; but they abound in strong and timely thoughts, expressed in manly, forcible, and appropriate language. Some of the leading abuses of Romanism are severely handled in the course of the volume; as are also the Romanizing tendencies of the Sacramentarians in the Church of England and in the Protestant Episcopal Church. In spite of certain doctrinal views with which we cannot agree, we cordially recommend this volume of "Sermons for the times" to our readers.

* * *

(13.) "*The Ways of Life, showing the Right Way and the Wrong Way*, by the Rev. G. S. Weaver;" (New-York: Fowler & Wells, 1855; 12mo., pp. 157;) a series of lectures delivered in St. Louis. There is a good substance of manly, honest thought and purpose in the book; it aims at a high and generous morality. The style is sometimes eloquent; always clear and forcible; but the sentences are often too brief and asthmatic for our taste.

* * *

(14.) Books on the Baptistic controversy have been greatly multiplied of late. One of the best and most useful that has come under our notice is, "*Baptism; its Nature, Obligation, Mode, Subjects and Benefits*, by L. Rosser, A. M." (Richmond: 1855; 12mo.) The work is divided into five parts, the topics of which are indicated in the title just cited. Each of these heads is treated at length, although the vital points of the controversy are of course more fully set forth than the others. The key to the author's view is that he regards the *mode* of baptism as nonessential; and that he considers its proper *subjects* to be infant children and believing adults. He grounds infant baptism upon the unconditional salvation of infants through Christ's redemption, showing that "in every dispensation of grace since the covenant was made with Abraham" their right to Church membership has been formally acknowledged. He holds, consequently, in opposition to the views of some of our writers—and, in our judgment, with better logic—that all children are entitled to baptism in their own right, apart from any consideration of parental piety, &c. Taken as a whole, the work is, as we have said, calculated to be eminently useful in general circulation. It has, however, some few faults. The writer is prolix, often to tediousness; his style is not always even perspic-

uous, and he abounds in repetitions. He needs to use greater care, and to spend more time upon his books, if he would have them last. The *limæ labor* is precisely the work to which he should turn himself.

(15.) THE history of German literature for the last three centuries is almost wholly a history of *Protestant* literature. Even the leading Catholic writers admit, that although the Roman Catholic part of Germany exceeds the Protestant, both in territory and in population, the vast majority of authors, in every department of science, are Protestants. Romanists complain, however, that the handbooks, in which the progress of literature is recorded, are all from Protestant hands, and have not, therefore, given impartial accounts: but the fact that those sources of knowledge *are* in Protestant hands is one of the very phenomena to be accounted for. To take away the reproach, and to secure justice to Roman writers, is one of the objects of the "*Geschichte der Katholischen Literatur in Deutschland*, (1854.) The author, Dr. Brühl, is a converted Jew. The promise of the work is greater than its performance: it is defective alike in point of style and of arrangement; nor is its matter as extensive, or as accurately worked out as could be wished. It is, nevertheless, the completest *apparatus* extant for the history of Catholic literature in Germany since the Reformation, in the branches to which the present volume is confined, namely, history and poetry. The author promises to follow it with a history of the other branches, and perhaps with a general survey of Roman Catholic literature.

(16.) THE American Baptist Publication Society has done well in reprinting Doddridge's "*Practical Discourses on Regeneration.*" (Philadelphia: 18mo., pp. 337.) A memoir of the excellent author is prefixed.

(17.) WE have received the "*Annual of Scientific Discovery for* 1855." (Boston: Gould & Lincoln, 1855; 12mo., pp. 394.) This valuable volume sets forth the most important discoveries and improvements in mechanics, chemistry, astronomy, and the physical sciences generally, and gives a list of recent publications and of patents; obituaries of eminent men; with notes on the progress of science, &c., during the past year. It is indispensable to every man of scientific or even of practical pursuits in active life.

(18.) "*A New and Extensive Analytical Examination of the Elements of Mental Science*, by the Rev. MOSES SMITH, A. M." (Cincinnati: printed for the author at the Methodist Book Concern, 1855; 12mo., pp. 491.) The design of the author, as stated in his preface, is "to present the philosophy of mind in as clear a light as possible—adapting the sentiments and arguments to the demands of the present age." The best part of the work, so far as we have examined it, is that which treats of volition. But one volume has reached us, though the preface promises two.

(19.) MR. LOUIS FASQUELLE, whose "New Method of Learning the French Language" has been heretofore commended in our pages, has issued, as a reading book, a very neat edition of "*Napoleon, par* A. DUMAS." (New-York: Ivison & Phinney, 1855; 12mo., pp. 273.) The text gives a compendious, but graphic sketch of the career of Napoleon, in a thoroughly French vein. The book is furnished with conversational exercises, explanatory notes, &c., admirably adapting it for use in schools.

(20.) The title of "*The Young Man Advised*, by E. O. HAVEN, D. D.," (New-York: Carlton & Phillips; 12mo., pp. 329,) gives no adequate idea of the excellent book which it is meant to designate. The work exhibits the leading facts of the Bible and confirms them by other evidence, historical and philosophical, for the purpose of showing the divinity of the word of God. The topics treated are those which are commonly pressed into the service of infidelity by ignorant or unfair men. Such topics, for instance, as the Creation, the Deluge, the Confusion of tongues, the Races of men, &c. These points are discussed with sufficient learning for the purpose, and the style of the work is such as to commend it to universal acceptance.

(21.) MESSRS. CARTER & BROTHERS have republished the *unabridged* edition of "*The Saint's Everlasting Rest*, by RICHARD BAXTER." (New-York: 1855; 8vo., pp. 662.) This is the first time, we think, that this great work has been fully presented to the American public; and although the abridgments are, perhaps, better adapted for popular reading, the more extended treatise will be welcome to all ministers, as well as to many reading men and women among the laity.

(22.) "*The Physical Geography of the Sea*, by M. F. MAURY, LL. D.," (New-York: Harper & Brothers; 1855; 8vo, pp. 274,) reveals a new world of observation to common readers. Our readers are aware that Mr. Maury is the great turnpike man of the ocean; and that, under his scientific guidance, "they that go down to the sea in ships" may now, for the most part, follow tracks as clearly defined as the lanes of a country neighbourhood. In this beautiful volume he unfolds, with a clearness peculiarly his own, the results of recent physical research into sea phenomena—winds, currents, salts, climate, inhabitants, &c.—and he has certainly succeeded in his aim of presenting "the gleanings from this new field in a manner that may be interesting and instructive to all, whether old or young, ashore or afloat, who desire a closer look into the wonders of the great deep."

(23.) "*The Teacher's Last Lesson*," (Boston: Gould & Lincoln; 1855; 12mo., pp. 284,) is a memoir of Miss Martha Whiting, late a teacher in the Female Seminary of Charlestown, Mass. It is made up, to a great extent, of extracts from Miss Whiting's journal, which, like almost all *diaries*, abounds in repetitions. But the book affords a good lesson of Christian devotion, and of zeal in the important work of school-teaching.

(24.) Of the "*Practical American Cook-book*" (New-York: D. Appleton & Co.; 1855; 12mo., pp. 267) we can only say, that to uninitiated readers, like ourselves, it looks well. We have read a recipe here and there that makes our mouths water. One thing is certain, that the science of cooking is yet in its beginnings in this country; and every book should be welcomed that tends to hasten the advent of a more civilized system in our kitchens, and thereby to diminish our national tendency to dyspepsia and liver complaint.

(25.) The fifth volume of "*The Lives of the Queens of Scotland*, by AGNES STRICKLAND," (New-York: Harper & Brothers; 1855,) continues the life of Mary Stuart up to the time of her imprisonment in Lochleven Castle. When completed this will be the fullest and most minute biography of Mary; but it is, as we have said before, so thoroughly a partisan view of the case that it requires to be read with caution.

(26.) "*History for Boys*, by JOHN G. EDGAR." (New-York: Harper & Brothers; 1855; 16mo., pp. 451.) This little book aims (and that successfully) to exhibit, in a manner attractive to juvenile readers, the most interesting and important events in the history of modern Europe. It is written, however, in a thoroughly English spirit.

(27.) "*The Family at Heatherdale*," (New-York: Carter & Brothers; 1855; 18mo., pp. 232,) is a story of Scottish life, designed to illustrate the influence of Christian principles upon the conduct of life. It has passed through three editions in Scotland, and deserves to run through as many here.

(28.) FLEETWOOD'S "*History of the Holy Bible*" has been reprinted in a handsome form by Messrs. R. Carter & Brothers. (New-York, 8vo., pp. 683.) The book, though without value for critical purposes, is well adapted for general circulation, and is especially attractive to children.

(29.) "*Christianity viewed in some of its Leading Aspects*, by the Rev. A. L. R. FOOTE." (Cincinnati: Swormstedt & Poe; 1855; 18mo., pp. 182.) This is a reprint of an excellent series of discourses, the English edition of which was briefly noticed in our pages some time ago. It treats of Christianity as a life, a work, a reward, a culture, a discipline and a fellowship; and each of these topics is worked out with much originality of thought and aptness of illustration. The style of the book is far beyond the ordinary standard of the religious literature of England, which, in this respect, is much inferior to that of America.

(30.) "*The Select Works of the Rev. Thomas Watson.*" (New-York: R. Carter & Brothers; 1855; 8vo., pp. 776.) This edition of an old and excellent author contains a brief biography of Watson; his catechetical lectures, forming a body of practical divinity; and his select sermons and devotional treatises. Watson is always sensible, and often, in quaint wit, and terse expression, he approaches Fuller.

(31.) MESSRS. CARTER & BROTHERS have reprinted "*The Miscellaneous Works of* MATTHEW HENRY," (New-York: 1855; 2 vols., 8vo.,) containing besides many of Henry's sermons, now first offered to American readers, forty discourses on "What Christ is made to believers," by Philip Henry, with the life of Philip. The rich evangelism of the Henrys makes even their scraps valuable.

(32.) "*Tricoloured Sketches in Paris.*" (New-York: Harper & Brothers: 1855; 12mo., pp. 368.) This volume contains the well-known letters from Paris, which appeared in the New-York Times in the years 1851–2–3. With many graphic sketches of life and manners, it contains, also, a veritable history of the times, set forth in pleasant and often sparkling language. The book is one of the best of its class; and the writer has evidently stuff in him for even better things.

(33.) "*Preces Paulinæ, or the Devotions of the Apostle Paul,*" (New-York: Carter & Brothers; 1855; 18mo., pp. 338,) is a collection of the prayers of St. Paul, as recorded in the Acts and Epistles. The conception of the book is ingenious, and it is well carried out. We commend the book as an excellent devotional manual.

(34.) "*Memoirs of the Countess of Blessington,* by R. R. MADDEN." (New-York: Harper & Brothers; 1855; 2 vols., 12mo.) Mr. Madden has not the slightest idea of what constitutes a true biography, and cannot even write good English; but yet the material for gossip—especially about literary men and women—that accumulated about the fair and frail Lady Blessington was so abundant that he could not help, by the aid of these accumulations, making a readable and interesting book. It is full of illustrations of the lamentable results that follow departures from virtue in man or woman.

(35.) "*The Speller and Definer's Manual,* by WILLIAM W. SMITH," (New-York: D. Burgess & Co.; 12mo., pp. 290,) is the most sensible book of its kind that has fallen under our notice. It contains a large collection of the most useful words in the language, arranged in classes, according to etymological analysis, with rules for prefixes, suffixes, &c., and all the apparatus for a practical text-book in schools. We are glad to see that the spelling is English and not Websterian; and we hope that Mr. Smith's book will supplant, generally, the spelling-books which are printed in that hybrid language.

(36.) "*Sanders' Young Ladies Reader,*" (New-York: Ivison & Phinney; 1855; 12mo., pp. 500,) embraces "a course of instruction in the principles of rhetorical reading," with a number of choice selections from the best writers, for exercises. The other reading books of the same compiler have been very widely circulated, and this, we think, is equally deserving.

(37.) "*Inez: a Tale of the Alamo*" (New-York: Harper & Brothers; 12mo., pp. 298) is a very weak anti-Romanist novel.

(38.) M. Huc, the Jesuit missionary, whose "Recollections of a Journey through Tartary and Thibet" made so great a sensation a year or two ago, has appeared again in "*A Journey through the Chinese Empire*," (New-York: Harper & Brothers; 1855; 2 vols., 12mo.,) which is, if possible, a work of greater attractiveness and importance than the other. Few men have had the opportunities of becoming acquainted with China that have fallen to his lot, and few could have used them to so good advantage. His descriptions have an air of truthfulness and reality about them which seems to be wanting in almost all other books of China; most travellers in the Flowery Land appear to see things in a mist, or, at all events, keep their readers in a fog; but M. Huc is as clear, transparent, and straight-forward as writers of his nation are wont to be. The only thing in the book that tests our power of belief at all, is the wonderful tact and skill that the missionary, according to his own account, displayed in getting out of all sorts of scrapes; but even in these cases he adapts his resources with great *vraisemblance* to the character of the Chinese as he describes them. The book will afford matter for a more extended article hereafter, if we can find room for it; in the meantime we commend it to our readers as the best account of Chinese life that has fallen under our notice. They will know how to make allowance for the writer's Romanism, and to judge of his *religious* observations accordingly.

(39.) "*Lectures on the Doctrine of Election*, by ALEXANDER C. RUTHERFORD." (Philadelphia: Higgins & Perkinpine; 12mo., pp. 288.) This is the work of a former minister in the United Secession Church, of Scotland, who has abandoned Calvinism. It treats, first, of the ultra-Calvinistic theory of election; and secondly, of the "moderate" theory, showing how widely both differ from the Scriptural theory, which is the third exhibited. Without coinciding with the author in all points, or approving, invariably, of the terms in which he has expressed himself with regard to his opponents, we can recommend his book as a valuable controversial treatise, setting forth the subject in a mode adapted to general readers as well as to professional ones.

(40.) "*The Minister's Family*, by the Rev. W. M. HETHERINGTON," (New-York: R. Carter & Brothers; 1855; 12mo,) is a very pious story, but, we are sorry to say, a very dull one.

(41.) "*An Introduction to Practical Astronomy*, by ELIAS LOOMIS, LL. D.," (New-York: Harper & Brothers; 8vo., pp. 497,) is the first and only book of its class published in America. It aims to give an adequate description of the instruments required in the outfit of an observatory, and also to explain the methods of employing them. Besides the chapters that treat of these topics, there are others on the Diurnal Motion, or Time, Latitude, the Ecliptic, Parallax, Eclipses, and the Longitude. Under these various heads an ample supply of problems is discussed. The book concludes with a large book of tables, many of which are new. To all teachers of astronomy, to all students of the higher class, and to amateurs who wish to pursue the subject thoroughly, this work will be indispensable.

(42.) Mr. ABBOTT has ended his series of Franconia Stories with "*Agnes*, by the author of the Rollo books." (New-York: Harper & Brothers, pp. 221.) The ten volumes furnish a beautiful and morally unexceptionable collection of reading for children. We know no drawback upon these and Mr. Abbott's other excellent books for the young, except the occasional provincialisms and inaccuracies of expression which disfigure them. Books for children should be even more carefully written than those for adults.

◆

(43.) "*Foster's First Principles of Chemistry*," (New-York: Harper & Brothers; 12mo., pp. 136,) is a strictly elementary book, designed for the use of schools and academies. The method is excellent, the style clear, and the illustrations abundant. With a box of apparatus, costing twenty-five dollars, and this little treatise, a careful teacher can give the pupils a better knowledge of the elements of chemistry than is carried away from college by most graduates.

◆

(44.) "*The Story of the Peasant-Boy Philosopher*, by HENRY MAYHEW," (New-York: Harper & Brothers; 16mo., pp. 477,) is a very entertaining and instructive book, founded on the early life of Ferguson, the astronomer. It is not a biography, but an illustration of the modes in which the boy's mind received its bent, and in which other boys may learn, and love to learn, the laws of nature. It is full of interest, and will be found as attractive to children as a fairy-tale.

◆

(45.) *Bradbury's Young Shawm*," (New-York: Mason Brothers,) is the very absurd name of a collection of school-music, which appears to be well adapted for the instruction of beginners.

◆

(46.) The "*Prose Writers of Germany*, by F. H. HEDGE." (New-York: C. S. Francis & Co.; 1855; 8vo., pp. 56.) This excellent compilation has passed to a third edition. The title does not convey a just notion of the contents of the book, which contains, in fact, a selection from the very best authors in the whole range of German literature, from Luther to Schleiermacher. Instead of giving a multitude of brief extracts, the editor has wisely chosen to give fewer writers, but larger and more satisfactory specimens of the style of each; and he has executed this delicate task with great judgment and skill. Readers, unacquainted with German, may obtain from this volume a very tolerable notion of the peculiar character and value of the vast literature of that language.

◆

(47.) "*A Guide-Book in the Administration of the Discipline of the Methodist Episcopal Church*, by OSMON C. BAKER, D. D." (New-York: Carlton & Phillips; 12mo., pp. 249.) This will hereafter be an essential *vade-mecum* for Methodist preachers. The only work attempting any of the ends aimed at in this treatise by Bishop Baker, is Bishop Hedding's "Discourse on the Administration of the Discipline," which, though admirable in its way, does not go into details to any great extent. The present work "descends to the very *minutiæ*

of the pastor's daily duties." It is divided into ten chapters, of which the first treats of Church Membership; the second, of the Conferences; the third, of Ministers; the fourth, of Certificates and Lovefeasts; the fifth, of Church trials; the sixth, of Church Property; the seventh, of Ministerial support; and the eighth, of Rules of Order. The ninth chapter gives a collection of forms, such as reports, licenses, &c.; and the tenth sets forth the prescribed courses of study for both travelling and local preachers. This *conspectus* will suffice to show the scope of the work. Its chief characteristic is good sense, the essential quality for such discussion. Though the views of the book are not offered as authoritative, we think there are very few of them that will be dissented from. The style is generally clear and perspicuous; but there are several inaccuracies of expression, which we hope will be corrected in future editions.

(48.) "*Leaves from a Family Journal, from the French of* EMILE SOUVESTRE," (New-York: D. Appleton & Co.; 12mo., pp. 277,) is a picture of domestic life in France. A young couple commence housekeeping, and find the usual difficulties incident to bringing up a family. The story is given with great delicacy and refinement, and many of the scenes are exquisitely painted.

(49.) "*Life in Earnest; or, Memoirs of the Rev.* ZENAS CALDWELL, by STEPHEN M. VAIL, A. M." (Boston: J. P. Magee; 12mo., pp. 188.) This is a sketch of the life and character of a very worthy young minister, who died in 1826, almost in the beginning of his career. He belonged to a family remarkable for sterling qualities, both mental and moral; and this memoir shows that he was a worthy scion of an excellent stock. Mr. Caldwell was the friend and associate of President Pierce in his student days, and the book is dedicated to him. It deserves wide circulation among the young men of the Church.

(50.) "*Sermons of the* Rev. I. S. SPENCER, D. D." (New-York: M. W. Dodd; 2 vols., 12mo.) Dr. Spencer was pastor of a Presbyterian Church in Brooklyn, and was thoroughly faithful and successful in his work. As a preacher, he was distinguished for simplicity, directness and force; and these qualities are all displayed in these two volumes of sermons. A memoir of Dr. Spencer, by the Rev. J. M. Sherwood, is prefixed.

(51.) "*The Ethics of Funerals*, by the Rev. J. B. WAKELEY," (New-York: 200 Mulberry-street; pp. 34,) is a vindication of the author and of the Methodist Episcopal Church "against the slanders of the New-York Churchman, with regard to the funeral of William Poole." What those slanders were is stated by Mr. Wakeley, as follows:—

> "They are, in substance, that I gave a 'Marc Antony exhibition over the coffin of Bill Poole, and in his honour;' that I made 'a monstrous connexion between Christianity and a profane bully, a brutal pugilist,' so monstrous that no 'Christian man in his senses could seriously entertain it;' that I, 'a so-called clergyman, worked out the happy thought for Bill Poole's associates, that how-

ever wicked their lives might be, all could be right at last;' that my remarks at the funeral amounted to '*profanity* and *blasphemy*;' that the Methodist Episcopal Church is 'a fanatical sect,' a 'religious community, calling itself Christian,' whose doctines, pushed far enough, amount to this, that 'however vile' a man's life may have been, 'any relenting at the hour of death *may* be taken as an expression of that faith which is to save the soul everlastingly.'"

Mr. Wakeley's vindication is ample and complete. His pamphlet is exceedingly severe; but justly so.

(52.) "*The whole French Language*, by T. Robertson," (New-York: Roe Lockwood & Son; 12mo., pp. 605;) with a Key, (12mo., pp. 107.) This book contains a series of French lessons, admirably adapted for class-teaching or for private use. The plan is novel; the text—a continuous and interesting story—is divided into short passages, which are to be translated and re-translated, analyzed and re-combined, until the words and the syntax become thoroughly familiar. We can give no adequate notion of the merits of the work in a brief notice; but we earnestly advise all teachers and students of French to examine it for themselves.

(53.) "*My Mother; or, Recollections of Maternal Influence*," (Boston: Gould & Lincoln; 12mo., pp. 254,) is not a biography, but a series of illustrations of the forming influence of a good mother's care, strung upon the thread of a loose narrative. It is an admirable book; its spirit, aim, and execution are alike excellent.

(54.) "*The May-Flower and Miscellaneous Writings*, by Harriet Beecher Stowe." (Boston: Phillips, Sampson & Co.; 12mo., pp. 471.) This volume contains a number of sketches, stories, &c., which have before been published in various forms. If any one doubts Mrs. Stowe's genius, let him read "Love and Law" in this volume; if he continues to doubt, we give him up. If she had never written "Uncle Tom," this volume contains proof enough of her dramatic and graphic faculty to put her into the first rank of American authors. There are a few provincialisms of expression—such as "tedious" for "annoying," "as" for "that," &c., which we are sorry to see.

(55.) "*Class-Meetings*, by the Rev. L. Rosser, A. M." (Richmond; 1855; 12mo., pp. 365.) This work is divided into five parts: of which the first treats of the origin and nature of class-meetings; the second, of their obligation; the third, of their benefits; the fourth, of objections and excuses; the fifth, of the duties they devolve upon preachers, leaders, and people; and the sixth, of their temporal advantages. The book is more comprehensive and complete than any of the others published of late years upon the topic; but, like the author's other writings that have fallen under our notice, it is often loose and prolix in style.

(56.) "*The Golden Reed, or the True Measure of a True Church*, by B. F. Barrett," (New-York: D. Appleton & Co.; 1855; 12mo., pp. 311,) is an

attempt to show that the religious society founded by Baron Swedenborg is a universal and truly catholic Church. The book is very well written, except the extracts from Swedenborg.

(57.) "*The History of Turkey*, by A. DE LAMARTINE." (New-York: D. Appleton & Co., vol. 1, 12mo.) Lamartine always writes the poetry of history; but not, on that account, any the less its truth. We regard him, as, in the main, one of the most truthful writers of the age. The present subject is admirably suited to his genius; he bathes you in the very atmosphere of orientalism; his paragraphs are paintings. Much of this first volume is, so to speak, legendary; the two volumes that follow will test the author's skill more fully than any task he has yet undertaken.

(58.) "*The History of Switzerland*, by H. ZSCHOKKE, *translated* by F. G. SHAW." (New-York: C. S. Francis & Co.; 12mo., pp. 405.) This work is the common text-book of the Swiss, in all the cantons, and it was a happy inspiration that led Mr. Shaw to translate it. It begins with the earliest periods, and carries the history down to 1848. Breathing the spirit of true liberty it should be welcome, doubly, to American youth.

(59.) "*A Commonplace Book of Thoughts, Memories, and Fancies*, by MRS. JAMIESON." (New-York: D. Appleton & Co.; 1855; 12mo., pp. 329.) Mrs. Jamieson has been in the habit for many years of jotting down any *thought* that might occur to her, or any passage in a book that might strongly arrest her attention. This book is made up of such jottings. It is divided into two parts: I. Ethics and Character; II. Literature and Art. Under the former head there is a genial sketch of Father Taylor, of Boston.

(60.) "*Travels in Europe and the East*, by SAMUEL IRENÆUS PRIME." (New-York: Harper & Brothers; 2 vols., 12mo.) Mr. Prime spent a year in travelling Great Britain, France, Germany, and the East; and, while abroad, kept up a correspondence with the New-York Observer, which was very widely read. The letters are gathered, with many additions, into these two handsome volumes, which contain a vast fund of entertaining and instructive reading.

(61.) "*Visits to European Celebrities*, by WILLIAM B. SPRAGUE, D. D," (Boston: Gould & Lincoln; 1855; 12mo., pp. 305,) is a gossipping, pleasant, and instructive account of the personal appearance and peculiarities of many of the most distinguished men and women of the nineteenth century. Dr. Sprague visited Europe in 1828, and again in 1836, and, on both occasions, he made it a study to get some personal knowledge, if possible, of all sorts of eminent people. Notes and memoranda, taken at the time, have been wisely suffered to lie quiet until most of the persons described have passed away; and they are now, as wisely, collected into this entertaining volume.

(62.) "*Experimental Religion*, by the REV. L. ROSSER." (Richmond, 1855, 12mo., pp. 181.) That this work should have already passed through five editions is no small testimony to its adaptation to the wants of the religious public. It treats of justification, regeneration, sanctification, and the witness of the Spirit, in clear and simple language, avoiding all technical discussion. The book is specially suited to young converts.

◆

(63.) "*The Christian Retrospect and Register*, by ROBERT BAIRD." (New-York: M. W. Dodd; 1855; 12mo., pp. 442.) We spoke very favourably of this book on its first appearance some years ago; and have now only to add that this new edition contains a supplementary chapter bringing the statistics of Christianity down to as late a period as possible. If the part relating to politics, science, &c., were omitted, and the space thus obtained devoted to religious facts and notices, the work would have more unity and more completeness.

◆

(64.) "*The Dead in Christ*, by JOHN BROWN, D. D.," (New-York: Carter & Brothers; 1855; 18mo., pp. 165,) is addressed chiefly to bereaved Christians, and presents them many points of comfort and consolation derived from the knowledge afforded us in Scripture with regard to the condition of the dead. Dr. Brown goes at some length into the proof of a separate state of conscious being between death and the resurrection. The work is inspired by Christian faith, and glows with a truly Christian hope.

◆

(65.) "*A Model for Men of Business*, by the REV. HUGH STOWELL," (New-York: Carlton & Phillips; 1855; 18mo., pp. 322,) is an excellent manual on the subject indicated by the title. It was originally published by the author as a course of lectures; but is here put into a more practical and readable shape. Prefixed to the work is a judicious introduction by Dr. Curry.

⁂ Several book notices are unavoidably omitted for want of room.

ART. X.—RELIGIOUS AND LITERARY INTELLIGENCE.

JOHN KITTO, D. D., so well known as a laborious writer in Biblical literature, died at Cannstatt, near Stuttgard, on the 25th of November, 1854. John Kitto was born at Plymouth, on the 4th December, 1804. His family was of Cornish origin; and in his "Lost Senses—Deafness," he speculates on the probability of his descent from a Phœnician ancestry. His father, who began life as a master builder, had, like Falstaff, a kind of "alacrity in sinking;" he became reduced to the position of a jobbing mason, in which business young Kitto's help was required at a very early age. While the boy was thus occupied, in February, 1817, a fall from the top of a house totally destroyed his sense of hearing. His previous education had been meagre; but the love of reading, which he had already acquired, became the solace of his loneliness and the foundation of his attainments. In 1819, his parents being unable to maintain or to find suitable employment for him, placed him in the workhouse, whence he was removed, in 1821, to become apprenticed to a shoemaker. His master was a coarse tyrant. The poor boy appealed to the

magistrates. His written statement was marked by a striking propriety of sentiment and diction. The indentures were cancelled, and he returned to the workhouse—to him a welcome refuge. He was not idle there. In 1823, his talents and capabilities being better understood, he was enabled, by the kindness of two gentlemen of the neighbourhood, to publish a small volume of essays and letters, and was placed in a position less unfavourable to self-improvement. The next ten years of Dr. Kitto's life appear to have been spent in travelling or residing abroad. He journeyed over a large part of Europe and Asia, and acquired that familiarity with the scenery and customs of the East which was afterward of such signal service in the department of literature to which he became devoted. Returning to England in 1833, he gained attention by a series of papers in the "Penny Magazine," under the title of "The Deaf Traveller," and having married, commenced a course of literary activity which was continued without interruption till within a few months of his decease. His exertions seem to have been prompted, from an early age, by a strong sense of *duty;* the duty of self-improvement, and of doing some service to the world. More palpable motives to laborious diligence were presented in the claims of an aged mother and a rapidly-increasing family. But his physical infirmity placed him at a disadvantage; and for several years before his death he was exposed to pecuniary difficulties, which his pension of one hundred pounds a year did not wholly remove. It is feared that he fell a victim to hard work and overpowering anxiety. A neuralgic affection of two years' standing was followed, last spring, by a paralytic or *quasi* paralytic attack. Through the kindly help of friends, the sufferer was removed in August, with his family, to the continent; but the deaths, in rapid succession, of his youngest and his eldest child, neutralized the benefit which might otherwise have been looked for from the change, and a third fit extinguished the feeble remains of life. Dr. Kitto's writings are well known. With a few exceptions, (relating chiefly to his own disability, and to his reminiscences of travel,) they aim, directly or indirectly, at the illustration of the sacred Scriptures. This was his chosen department of labour, and in it he attained a high degree of eminence. We subjoin a list of his publications:—"Bible History of the Holy Land," 8vo.; "Court and People of Persia," 18mo.; "Cyclopædia of British Literature," 2 vols. roy. 8vo.; also, an "Abridged" and a "People's" edition of this Cyclopædia; "Daily Bible Illustrations," 8 vols. 12mo.; "Essays and Letters," with a Memoir, 12mo.; "Geography of the Holy Land," with Atlas, roy. 8vo.; "History of Palestine," 12mo.; "Pictorial" ditto, 2 vols. roy. 8vo.; "Lost Senses, Deafness and Blindness," 2 vols. 18mo.; "Physical Geography of the Holy Land," 2 vols. 18mo.; "Pictorial Life of our Saviour," 4to.; "Scripture Lands and Bible Atlas," 12mo.; "The Tabernacle and its Furniture," 4to. He also established and conducted, until within two years, "The Journal of Sacred Literature," which has since passed into the hands of Rev. G. Burgess.

A NEW edition of "*The Works of Robert Sanderson*, Bishop of Lincoln," (Oxford; 1854; bds. 8vo.,) has appeared, from the Clarendon press, carefully edited by Professor Jacobson. Its most important parts are the semi-scholastic treatises "De Obligatione Conscientiæ," and "De Juramenti Obligatione:" but it contains besides several treatises, sermons, &c., now printed for the first time.

"*Le Bouddhisme, son fondateur et ses écritures*, par FELIX NEVE," Professor at Louvain, (Paris: 1854,) is said to contain a good *résumé* of the facts and the literature of Buddhism.

An edition of Calvin's "*Treatise on Relics*," newly translated from the French original, with an Introductory Dissertation on the Miraculous Images, as well as other Superstitions, of the Roman Catholic and Russo-Greek Churches, has recently appeared in Edinburgh. The *Witness* speaks of it as "a complete philosophical and historical treatise on the saint and image worship of the Roman and Russian Churches. It abounds with curious and interesting information, and, what is more, it is interspersed with judicious reflections, exposing the follies which it records, and furnishing brief satisfactory replies to the specious arguments by which these follies have been supported. The most interesting portion of this volume, at the present time, is the chapter in which our author treats of the Greco-Russian Church."

"*An Account of the Printed Text of the Greek New Testament; with Remarks on its Revision upon Critical Principles; together with a Collation of the Critical Texts of Griesbach, Scholz, Lachmann, and Tischen-*

dorff, with that in Common Use. By S. PRIDEAUX TREGELLES, LL.D." (London: Bagsters, 1854; 8vo., pp. 390.) This is certainly one of the most important and valuable works for the criticism of the text of the New Testament that has yet appeared in Great Britain. It contains a mass of valuable information, for which the student would otherwise have to search through many scarce and costly volumes. A mere statement of its contents will suffice to this. It gives a full account (pp. 1–174) of all the editions of the Greek text, from the Complutensian down to the latest labours of Lachmann, Tischendorf, and Tregelles. Then follow (pp. 174–226) remarks upon the principles of textual criticism, in which a full and satisfactory theory is clearly set forth and ably maintained. The remainder of the main body of the work is taken up with notes on various passages of dogmatic importance, (pp. 226–274.) After all this comes a separate and elaborate *collation* of the critical texts of Griesbach, Scholz, Lachmann, and Tischendorff with that in common use, arranged in parallel columns: so that the student is actually better off with this volume in his hand, than with the text of these editors before him. We recommend this most valuable work to the careful attention of all *faithful* Biblical students.

"*Geschichte der Americanischen Urreligion*," (History of the Primitive Religion of America,) by J. G. MULLER, Professor of Theology at the University of Basel. (Basel; 1855; pp. 706.) This is a work of great learning and research, and therefore a most valuable contribution to the ecclesiastical history of the world in general and of America in particular. The author, who is distinguished for his attainments in classic as well as in Church history, has carefully examined all the sources of information on his subject, and communicates to us, on almost every page, the discoveries of modern science in the primitive history of religious systems. The *Introduction* undertakes to show: 1. That the Indians did not receive their forms of worship from the ancient nations of the old world; 2. That their religious opinions may, therefore, be said to be aboriginal; and 3. That the disagreement of the Indians in these opinions is best explained by the difference of their relations to nature. The two chief divisions of the book are: I. The religion of the savage tribes, (red men; the inhabitants of the great Antilles; the Caribs, the east of South America.) II. The religion of the civilized tribes, (the Peruvians, Muyscas, and Mexicans.) We shall endeavour to recur to this work hereafter, and to point out some serious errors into which the learned author has fallen.

IN France, as in all Catholic countries, the civil law forbids any Catholic who has received a clerical order, and afterward wishes to leave the ranks of the priesthood, to get lawfully married. All attempts to abrogate this law have been frustrated by the exertions of the bishops. The treatise of Bishop Pavy, of Algiers, "*Du Celibat Ecclesiastique*," (on Ecclesiastical Celibacy,) is a specimen of the kind of pleading by which Catholic prelates maintain *their* opinions on religious liberty. A deacon in the Roman Catholic Church of Algiers felt no vocation to pursue his ecclesiastical studies, entered on *another* career, and resolved to get married. The ecclesiastical authority opposes; the civil courts of Bona, however, support the right of the claimant; then the Bishop of Algiers himself addresses a letter to General Hautpoul, the Governor of Algiers. The governor intervenes with the ministers of war, of justice, and of worship; and, finally, the poor deacon is declared deprived of the right of marrying, and the Catholic party and the Catholic press exclaim rejoicingly. The support of the civil law has always been given to the ecclesiastical law of celibacy; and, it may be said, that on this point the legislation of France is settled.

FATHER DE RAVIGNAN is the most celebrated among the French Jesuits of the present age, and stands first perhaps among the Catholic pulpit celebrities of France. He is also known to the public as one of the most influential writers of the order; and he has come forward several times for its defence. In his work "*Clement XIII. et Clement XIV.*, par le pere DE RAVIGNAN:" (Paris; 1854; 2 vols., pp. 574 and 502) he represents the Jesuitic side in the hot discussion which has been going on for some years with regard to Pope Clement XIV., who suppressed the Jesuits. Not long ago a priest of high standing in Rome, although by birth a German, Augustin Theiner, Priest of the Oratorium, Prefect-coadjutor of the Archives of the Vatican, Consultor of the Congregation of the Index and other congregations, a member of the special Congregation on the Immaculate Conception, etc., etc., published a "*History of the Pontificate of Clement XIV.*," from unprinted documents of the secret

archives of the Vatican, (Paris: Didot; 3 vols.,) in which he tried to exalt Clement XII. as one of the greatest popes; and, in order to achieve this, came out very severely against the Jesuits of that time. Of course, a book like this created indescribable confusion in the Catholic world, which is now more than ever under the influence of the Jesuits. The French historian of the order, Cretineau-Joly, undertook the defence of the Jesuits; but, alas! his book was put on the Index. The general of the Jesuits, P. Roothan, fearing that the controversy might turn out badly for the order, declined all responsibility for Cretineau-Joly's work, but wrote at the same time to P. de Ravignan, to intervene with his name and talent for his brethren. Such is the origin of this book. It tries to justify both the Jesuits and the pope who suppressed them. In its zeal for the honour of the pope, the author denies even such indisputable facts as the agreement by which Ganganelli, before the election, bound himself to Spain, to suppress the order. Nevertheless, the work has valuable material for the history of the order, as the great part of the second volume consists of documents heretofore unknown.

Among the new works announced on the continent of Europe are the following:—

Symbolik der christlichen Confessionen und Religionspartheien von Prof. Dr. A. H. Baier. 1. Bd.: Symbolik der römisch-kathol. Kirche. 2. Abthl: Der röm. Katholicismus in der Organisation seiner besonderen Sphären. gr. 8. (iv pp. und pp. 253–619. Greifswald.

Vorlesungen ueber praktische Theologie von Dr. J. H. Aug. Ebrard. gr. 8. (xiv and 378 pp.) Königsberg.

Das Wesen der Kirche beleuchtet nach Lehre u. Geschichte d. Neuen Testamentes mit vornehml. Rücksicht auf die Streitfrage zwischen Protestantismus u. Katholicismus v. Semin. Repetent Jul. Koestlin. gr. 8. (vii and 128 pp.) Stuttgart.

Geschichte des alten Bundes v. Prof. Dr. Joh. Heinr. Kurtz. (2. Bd. in 2 Abthl.) gr. 8. (1. Abthl. pp. 1–320.) Berlin, 1855.

Novum testamentum triglottum graece latine germanice; graecum textum addito lectionum variarum delectu recensuit, latinum Hieronymi notata Clementina lectione ex autoritate codd. restituit, germanicum ad pristinam Lutheranae editionis veritatem revocavit Aenoth. Jud. Const. Tischendorf. 8vo. (xlii and 930 pp.) Lipsiæ.

Das alte Testament im neuen Testament von Dr. A. Tholuck. Ueber die Citate d. Alten Testaments im Neuen Testament u. üb. d. Opfer- u. Priesterbegriff im alten u. neuen Testament. [Zwei Beilagen zu d. Kommentare üb. d. Brief an die Hebräer.] 4. verm. Aufl. gr. 8. (iv and 116 pp.) Gotha.

Auberlen, Dr. C. A., Der Prophet Daniel und die Offenbarung Johannis in ihrem gegenseitigen Verhältniss betrachtet und in ihren Hauptstellen erläutert. 8. Basel. 449 pp.

Among the new books recently announced in Great Britain are the following:—

Scriptural Predestination, with Remarks upon the Baptismal Question. By the Rev. Robert Knight. 1 vol. 8vo.:—Jashar. Fragmenta Archetypa, Carminum Hebraicorum in Masorethico Veteris Testamenti Textu passim tessellata collegit, restituit ordinavit, in unum corpus redegit, Latine exhibuit, commentario instruxit Joannes Gulielmus Donaldson, S. Theologiæ Doctor, Collegii SS. Trinitatis apud Cantabrigienses quondam Socius. 8vo.:—Three new volumes of Owen's Works; being the Second Issue of the Exposition to the Hebrews, and embracing volumes ii, iii, and iv of the Work:—Christ as made known to the Ancient Church: An Exposition of the Revelation of Divine Grace, as unfolded in the Old Testament Scriptures. By the late Robert Gordon, D. D, F. R. S. E.: 4 vols., demy 8vo.:—The Christian Cyclopædia; or, Repertory of Biblical and Theological Literature. By the Rev. James Gardner, M. D. and A. M. Imp. 8vo.:—The Inspiration of Holy Scripture, its Nature and Proof. By the Rev. W. Lee, J. C. D. 8vo.:—Lectures on the History of Ancient Philosophy. By the Rev. W. Archer Butler, late Professor of Moral Philosophy in the University of Dublin. Edited, from the Author's Manuscripts, by W. H. Thompson, M. A. 2 vols., 8vo.:—A Second Series of Sermons. Edited from the Manuscripts of the Rev. W. Archer Butler, by the Rev. J. A. Jeremie, D. D. 8vo.

THE

METHODIST QUARTERLY REVIEW.

OCTOBER, 1855.

Art. I.—THE FIRST CHAPTER IN THE HISTORY OF AMERICAN METHODISM.

About a hundred and fifty years ago, a colony of Germans from the Palatinate emigrated from their fatherland and settled upon the rich and fertile lands of the county of Limerick, in the west of Ireland. Their descendants are still called Palatines; and although they have long since lost the language of their ancestors, yet they have not lost their German character for industry, thrift, and honourable dealing. They are among the most wealthy and prosperous farmers of the country.

When Mr. Wesley and his lay "helpers" found their way into that part of the country, about the middle of the last century, these Palatines were among the first to receive the doctrines which they preached, and to experience their wondrous and transforming power. Among them was a youth by the name of Philip Embury, who records his conversion in the following language:—" On Christmas day, being Monday, the 25th of December, in the year 1752, the Lord shone into my soul, by a glimpse of his redeeming love, being the earnest of my redemption in Christ Jesus, to whom be glory forever and ever, Amen." Mr. Wesley was in the county of Limerick in August, 1752; but whether he was immediately and directly instrumental in the happy change of Philip Embury, we have now no means of knowing; but they were personally acquainted with each other.

Between the accession of the house of Hanover in 1714, and the war of Independence, a very large number of Protestants from the north and west of Ireland emigrated to this country, and settled in the southern part of New-Hampshire, in western Massachusetts, in the city of New-York, in New-Jersey, in the western part of Pennsylvania, in the Great Valley of Virginia, and in the rich parts of

North and South Carolina, especially upon the Yadkin and Catawba. These valuable emigrants soon became an element of great force in the polyglot population of the colonies; and entering with characteristic spirit into the struggle for our national independence, they furnished the American army some distinguished commanders, among which were Sullivan and Stark. President Jackson, who was born on the Waxhaw Creek, N. C., in 1765, was of this race. But the influence of this class of emigrants upon our political character and destiny is greatly overshadowed by another historical fact of far greater significance and importance. Two of the most numerous and powerful religious bodies in the United States arose chiefly out of this emigration—the Methodist Episcopal and the Presbyterian Churches. The Presbyterian Church was everywhere planted by these emigrants; the celebrated Tennent family, who were among its earliest pioneers, having come over about 1718. The origin of the Methodist Episcopal Church was on this wise:—

Among those who settled in New-York, about 1765, was Mr. Embury, before mentioned, who had now become a local preacher. This must have been previous to September of that year, as he had a son born to him on the 24th of that month in John-street in that city. Several other Irish Methodists also emigrated about the same time; but finding none of the same profession, and being as sheep without a shepherd, some of them soon wandered from God; and so far did they depart from their duty, as to indulge in the frivolous and sinful amusements of the world.

But they were soon to return to their duty and to their God, and to be the humble pioneers of a mighty and glorious work on this continent. Among these emigrants was a pious family by the name of Hick, from Ballingrane. One evening the mother* of this family went into a company of these backslidden Methodists, of whom Mr. Embury was one, and finding them engaged in card-playing, she immediately seized the pack and indignantly threw it into the fire. Then turning to Mr. Embury, she exclaimed, "Brother Embury, you must preach to us, or we shall all go to hell, and God will require our blood at your hands." Alarmed and astonished at this earnest and unexpected reproof, and willing to say something to justify himself, Mr. Embury replied, "How can I preach, for I

---

* This "elect lady," whose maiden name was Barbara Ruckle, before her emigration to America lived in a house opposite the present Methodist Chapel in Ballingrane. The house is not now standing; but members of the family still survive in that place, and her descendants, "to the third and fourth generation," are yet found in the Methodist churches in New-York.

have neither a house nor a congregation?" "Preach in your own house, and to our own company first," was the ready reply. To this reasonable proposition he consented. An appointment was accordingly made, and Philip Embury preached the first Methodist sermon on this continent, in his own house, to five persons only. He soon formed a class consisting mostly of his own countrymen, the German Irish. This was in the latter part of 1766. About the close of the year they were joined by two brethren by the name of Louse and White, from Dublin. They now began to take courage in their new enterprise.

Soon a private house became too strait for the infant congregation, and encouraged by their success they rented a room in the most infamous part of the city—near the barracks—invading the very precincts of the powers of darkness, and making war upon ignorance and vice within their own domain. One day, while engaged in worship in this obscure temple, supposing themselves

"Little and unknown,
Loved and prized by God alone,"

the humble worshippers were amazed and even somewhat alarmed by the appearance, in their midst, of a stately and dignified figure in the uniform of a British officer. They feared insult and molestation. But they soon observed that he knelt with them in prayer, and were also further gratified and surprised to see that he demeaned himself with the most reverent propriety. He immediately made himself known to them. It was Captain Thomas Webb. He had been a lieutenant under the gallant and impetuous Wolfe at the capture of Quebec in 1759, where he had lost his right eye, and had been wounded in the arm. About the year 1765, after great internal struggles and much mental distress, in which he almost despaired of the divine mercy, he was happily converted to God, and joined the Methodist society under Mr. Wesley. It was not long before he made his first attempt as a public speaker, in Bath, England. The congregation with which he was waiting being disappointed of their preacher, he was called upon to address them, which he did with such acceptance, as soon to induct him into the office of a local preacher. Soon after this event, he was appointed barrack-master in Albany, in the province of New-York, whither he immediately removed with his family. Here, establishing "a Church in his own house," several of his neighbours desired permission to be present at his family worship, which was granted. To these he soon adopted the practice of addressing a word of exhortation; and thus Albany became one of the first scenes for the display of Wesleyan

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

zeal and devotion, although with no immediate results. Being in New-York, about this time, he heard of the little society under Mr. Embury, and in the true spirit of "a soldier of the cross," he was not ashamed of the great difference between their social position and his own, and sought them out. His first interview with them has been described. This event constituted an era in their progress.

Captain Webb now began to preach among them. The novelty of a man in regimentals with his sword and *chapeau* laid at his side preaching the Gospel of peace, immediately attracted crowds to hear. The preacher was a man who eminently united the more noble characteristics of the soldier with the *esprit du corps* of the religious body to which he belonged. His bluntness and earnest zeal, while he declared to his astonished auditors "that all their knowledge and religion were not worth a rush, except their sins were forgiven, and they had the witness of the Spirit with theirs, that they were the children of God," but increased the surprise and amazement of some, while others, more thoughtful and considerate, were led to seek this "pearl of great price," and to take the kingdom of heaven by violence."

Soon this place, also, was too small for them, and they began to look around for more ample accommodations. Presently they found a rigging loft, eighteen by sixty feet, not distinguished, indeed, by architectural proportions and adornment, but fully answering their immediate wants. It was at once fitted up for their reception, and thither the infant society repaired, thinking themselves truly happy in their unexpected enlargement. This building, thus identified with the early history of American Methodism, was recently standing, No. 120 William-street, an honoured memorial of the labours and successes of the past. Here Mr. Embury preached on Thursday evenings, and twice on the Sabbath; and here his humble auditors, in the glorious hope of finally worshipping in the great temple above, wept and prayed and sang and shouted, while God gave an increase both of grace and of members.

In the mean time Captain Webb removed to the neighborhood of Jamaica, Long Island, where his wife's relatives resided. Here he also commenced preaching, first in his own house, and then in various other places. In the course of six months twenty-four were converted to God, about one-half of whom were coloured people. Persons of this unfortunate race were also among the "first-fruits" of Wesleyan labours in the city of New-York.

While Captain Webb, to use his own language, was thus engaged "in felling trees on Long Island," the little society in New-York, finding even the Rigging Loft not half large enough to accommodate

the multitudes that attended the preaching, seriously began to think of erecting a place of worship. But serious and formidable difficulties presented themselves in the very outset. At this time there were but two classes in the society, one of men and one of women, and of these there was but one person of property besides Captain Webb, viz., a Mr. Lupton. In this emergency, they at once betook themselves to God by prayer and fasting for his direction. While thus engaged, Mrs. Hick, the lady before mentioned, received an answer, attended with great sweetness and power, "I the Lord will do it;" while at the same time a plan of action was suggested to her mind, which, upon being presented to the society for their consideration, was adopted. Lots were accordingly purchased, and arrangements made to build. At this stage of their progress one of the society thus wrote to Mr. Wesley:—

> "We had some consultations how to remedy this inconvenience, and Mr. Embury proposed renting a small lot of ground for twenty-one years, and to exert our utmost endeavours to build a wooden tabernacle; a piece of ground was proposed; the ground-rent was agreed for, and the lease was to be executed in a few days. We, however, in the mean time, had two several days for fasting and prayer, for the direction of God and his blessing on our proceedings; and Providence opened such a door as we had no expectation of. A young man, a sincere Christian and constant hearer, though not joined in society, not giving anything toward this house, offered ten pounds to buy a lot of ground, went of his own accord to a lady who had two lots to sell, on one of which there is a house that rents for eighteen pounds per annum. He found the purchase-money of the two lots was six hundred pounds, which she was willing should remain in the purchaser's possession, on good security. We called once more on God for his direction, and resolved to purchase the whole. There are eight of us who are joint-purchasers: among whom Mr. Webb and Mr. Lupton are men of property. I was determined the house should be on the same footing as the orphan house at New-Castle, and others in England; but as we were ignorant how to draw the deeds, we purchased for us and our heirs, until a copy of the writing is sent us from England, which we desire may be sent by the first opportunity.
>
> "Before we began to talk of building, the devil and his children were very peaceable; but since this affair took place, many ministers have cursed us in the name of the Lord, and laboured with all their might to stop their congregations from assisting us. But He that sitteth in the highest laughed them to scorn. Many have broken through, and given their friendly assistance. We have collected above one hundred pounds more than our own contributions, and have reason to hope in the whole we shall have two hundred pounds: but the house will cost us four hundred pounds more; so that unless God is pleased to raise up friends we shall yet be at a loss. I believe Mr. Webb and Mr. Lupton will borrow or advance two hundred pounds, rather than the building should not go forward; but the interest of money here is a great burden—being seven per cent. Some of our brethren proposed writing to you for a collection in England: but I was averse to this, as I well know our friends there are overburdened already. Yet so far I would earnestly beg: if you would intimate our circumstances to particular persons of ability, perhaps God would open their hearts to assist this infant society, and contribute to the first preaching-house on the original Methodist plan in all America."

These lots were situated in John-street, in what was then the upper part of the city, and in a neighbourhood then called Golden Hill. Here they erected a plain stone chapel, sixty feet in length by forty-two in width, two stories in height, and with galleries on three sides. In order to evade a law of the province in relation to the erection of such houses of worship, it was supplied with fire-places, like a dwelling-house. Mr. Embury, who was a house-carpenter by occupation, built the pulpit, and did the joiner-work with his own hands; and on the 30th of October, 1768, he also consecrated it by a sermon from Hosea x, 12: "Sow to yourselves in righteousness, reap in mercy; break up your fallow ground: for it is time to seek the Lord, till he come and rain righteousness upon you." With characteristic plainness, he declared, that "the best consecration of a pulpit was to preach a good sermon in it." Thus was built, by a feeble band, the first Methodist church on this continent. In honour of the venerable founder of Methodism it was called Wesley Chapel. It was seated with benches, and remained in an unfinished state for several years. It stood until its two little classes had increased to 225,000, and filled the land in its length and breadth, and the place of their humble pastor, with his saw and hammer, was supplied by some 1,560 local and travelling preachers. This chapel, after having stood almost half a century, was finally taken down in 1817, to give place to a more ample and imposing structure, which also, in its turn, upon some improvements being made in that portion of the city, gave place to a third edifice about the year 1840.

About the time of the formation of the society in New-York, Mr. Robert Strawbridge, also a local preacher from Ireland, settled on Pipe Creek in Frederick, now Carroll County, in the northern part of Maryland. Like Embury and Captain Webb, he first began to preach in his own house; and such was his success, that he soon formed a very respectable society, and built a chapel, called the Log Meeting-House. Some have asserted that this log meeting-house on Pipe Creek was built as early, if not earlier, than Wesley Chapel, in New-York; and hence have been ready to claim for it the honour of being the first erected on this continent. But as this claim has never been properly authenticated by reference to unimpeachable authorities, it cannot be admitted. It is to be extremely regretted, however, that there is no authentic account of the precise time of the formation of the Pipe Creek Society, and of the erection of its meeting-house, with the particulars respecting them. But we know not that Mr. Strawbridge himself ever wrote anything whatever for the public eye; and those who might have ascertained the facts, neglected to do so, at the time, and have now passed away: so that

we have now no means whatever of ascertaining the precise truth in the case.*

Hence also we have but very little information respecting Mr. Strawbridge himself, whose labours, it is well known, contributed largely to the establishment of Methodism in the United States. When and where he was born; when he was converted to God, and joined the Wesleyan Society; the precise time in which he arrived in this country; where he first landed; and when and where he died, are to us now wholly unknown. He was, however, a zealous and active preacher. He extended his pious and successful labours through various parts of Maryland, on both shores, and also into Virginia. Upon the arrival of the regular itinerant missionaries in America, he connected his labours, which, at first, were conducted wholly on his own responsibility, with theirs. His name appears on the Minutes for 1773 and 1775; after which this earliest pioneer of American Methodism, except Embury, seems to have reverted to his former position as a local preacher, and finally disappears from our view; and "his burying-place," like that of Moses, is probably "not known to Israel to this day."

Methodism was also introduced into Philadelphia about this time, probably by the labours of Captain Webb, who formed a flourishing society, which soon amounted to one hundred members. Here the first conference in America was subsequently held. From what we can gather from the Journals of Mr. Asbury and from the incidental remarks of contemporaries, this society in Philadelphia seems to have been distinguished for its pious and excellent character.

Thus, by the labours of three local preachers, one of whom was a captain in the royal service, one a house-carpenter, and the other, probably, a farmer, was Methodism firmly established, by the formation of permanent societies, in three of the principal colonies, and had also, probably, been preached in two others, before a regular itinerant had set his foot upon our soil.

But the pressing exigencies of the work now demanded the presence and labour of men wholly devoted to its promotion. Accordingly, as soon as the little society in New-York had purchased the lots in John-street, and resolved to build a chapel thereon, one of their members, in a letter before quoted under date of April 11th, 1768, thus writes to Mr. Wesley:—

---

* Although there is no proof that the Log Meeting-House at Pipe Creek was older than Wesley Chapel in New-York, yet there is positive proof that the Pipe Creek Society was formed before that in New-York, and thus, in point of time, takes the precedence of all others. See Asbury's Journals, vol. iii, p. 24, new edition.

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

> "There is another point far more material, and in which I must importune your assistance, not only in my own name, but also in the name of the whole society. We want an able and experienced preacher; one who has both gifts and grace necessary for the work. God has not, indeed, despised the day of small things. There is a real work of grace begun in many hearts, by the preaching of Mr. Webb and Mr. Embury; but although they are both useful, and their hearts in the work, they want many qualifications for such an undertaking; and the progress of the Gospel here depends much upon the qualifications of preachers.
>
> "In regard to a preacher, if possible we must have a man of wisdom, of sound faith, and a good disciplinarian; one whose heart and soul are in the work; and I doubt not but by the goodness of God such a flame will be soon kindled as would never stop until it reached the great South Sea. We may make many shifts to evade temporal inconveniences; but we cannot purchase such a preacher as I have described. Dear sir, I entreat you, for the good of thousands, to use your utmost endeavours to send one over."

For some reason, Mr. Wesley did not attend even to this most forcible and importunate appeal. More than a year elapsed before it was definitely answered, during which the request of Mr. Embury was added to that of this writer. In his Ecclesiastical History, under date of 1769, Mr. Wesley says:—

> "Tuesday,* August 1. Our conference began at Leeds. On Thursday, I mentioned the case of our brethren in New-York. For some years past, several of our brethren from England and Ireland (and some of them preachers) had settled in North America, and had in various places formed societies, particularly in Philadelphia and New-York. The society in New-York had lately built a commodious preaching-house, and now desired our help; being in great want of money, but much more of preachers. Two of the preachers, Richard Boardman and Joseph Pillmore, willingly offered themselves for this service, by whom we determined to send over fifty pounds, as a token of our brotherly love.*

Mr. Boardman had joined the travelling connexion in 1763, and Mr. Pillmore in 1765. Both, therefore, were very recently in the work. But they were men of good sense and ardent piety, of adequate talents as preachers, and truly and earnestly devoted to the important work of the ministry. But as an almost necessary consequence of the want of longer experience, they were not good disciplinarians, and, therefore, not so well qualified for government.

They seem to have lost no time, after the close of the conference, at which they received their appointments as the first Wesleyan missionaries to the new world, in making all needful preparations for their voyage across the Atlantic, and in hastening to enter upon the work to which they had devoted themselves. They sailed about the latter part of August, and after an inclement and tedious passage of nine weeks, they landed at Gloucester Point, six miles below Philadelphia, on the 24th of October. At the end of a week after

---

° Wesley's Works, vol. vii, p. 388.

their arrival, Mr. Pillmore addressed the following letter to Mr. Wesley:—

"Philadelphia, *October* 31*st*, 1769.

"Reverend Sir,—By the blessing of God we are safe arrived here, after a tedious passage of nine weeks. We were not a little surprised to find Captain Webb in town, with a society of about a hundred members, who desire to be in close connexion with you. This is the Lord's doing, and it is marvellous in our eyes.

"I have preached several times, and the people flock to hear in multitudes. Sunday night I went out upon the common. I had the stage appointed for the horse-race for my pulpit, and, I think, between four and five thousand hearers, who heard with attention still as night. Blessed be God for field-preaching! When I began to talk of preaching at five o'clock in the morning, the people thought it would not answer in America. However, I resolved to try, and had a very good congregation. There seems to be a great and effectual door opening in this country, and I hope many souls will be gathered in. The people in general like to hear the word, and seem to have some ideas of salvation by grace. They seem to set light to opinions. That which is the most prevalent is, 'universal salvation.' And if this be true, then, perhaps, (as Count Zinzendorf observed,) 'we may see the devil falling before the Saviour, and kissing his feet.' I have been to visit Mr. Stringer, who is well. He bears a noble testimony for our blessed Jesus; and I hope God does bless him.

"When I parted with you at Leeds, I found it very hard work. I have reason to bless God, that I ever saw your face. And though I am well nigh four thousand miles from you, I have an inward fellowship with your spirit. Even while I am writing, my heart flows with love to you, and all our dear friends at home. In a little time we shall all meet in our Father's kingdom,

'Where all the storms of life are o'er,
And pain and parting are no more.'

"This, reverend and dear sir, is and shall be the earnest prayer of your unworthy son in the Gospel, J. Pillmore."

Mr. Boardman, soon after his arrival, set out for New-York, to take charge of the society in that place, from whence he thus writes to Mr. Wesley:—

"New-York, *November* 4*th*, 1769.

"Reverend Sir,—After a nine weeks' voyage of great difficulties, we safely arrived at Philadelphia. Several said there had not, in the memory of the oldest man on the continent, been such hard gales of wind as for these few months past. Many vessels have been lost, while others got in with loss of masts, and much damage to their cargoes. We observed shipwrecks all along the coast of the Delaware. I never understood David's words as I now do: 'They that go down to the sea in ships, that do business in great waters; these see the works of the Lord, and his wonders in the deep.' In calm, serene weather, I found much exercise of mind—strong temptations, and great dejection; in rough, stormy weather, when it appeared morally impossible the vessel should live long, amid conflicting elements, I found myself exceeding happy, and rested satisfied that death would be gain. I do not remember to have had one doubt of being eternally saved, should the mighty waters swallow us up. This was the Lord's doing. O, may it ever be marvellous in my eyes

"When I came to Philadelphia, I found a little society, and preached to a great number of people. I left brother Pillmore there, and set out for New-York. Coming to a large town on my way, and seeing a barrack, I asked a soldier if there were any Methodists belonging to it? 'O yes,' said he, 'we are all Methodists: that is, we should all be glad to hear a Methodist preach.' 'Well,' said I, 'tell them in the barrack, that a Methodist preacher, just come from England, intends to preach here to-night' He did so, and the inn was surrounded with soldiers. I asked, 'Where do you think I can get a place to preach in?' (it being then dark.) One of them said, 'I will go and see, if I can get the Presbyterian meeting-house.' He did so: and soon returned to tell me he had prevailed, and that the bell was just going to ring, to let all the town know. A great company soon got together, and seemed much affected.

"The next day, I came to New-York. Our house contains about seventeen hundred hearers.* About a third part of those who attend the preaching, get in; the rest are glad to hear without. There appears such a willingness in the Americans to hear the word, as I never saw before. They have no preaching in some parts of the back settlements. I doubt not, but an effectual door will be opened among them. O, may He now give his Son the heathen for his inheritance.

"The number of blacks that attend the preaching affects me much. One of them came to tell me, she could neither eat nor sleep, because her master would not suffer her to come to hear the word. She wept exceedingly, saying, 'I told my master I would do more work than I used to do, if he would but let me come; nay, that I would do everything in my power to be a good servant.'

"I find a great want of every gift and grace for the great work before me. I should be glad of your advice. But, dear sir, what shall I say to almost everybody I see? They ask, 'Does Mr. Wesley think that he shall ever come over to see us?'

"I am, dear sir, your affectionate son and servant,

"R. BOARDMAN."

In accordance with the usages of the society, Mr. Pillmore presently changed places with Mr. Boardman at New-York, from whence he sends the following epistle "To the Rev. J. Wesley and all the Brethren in Conference:"—

"NEW-YORK, *May 5th*, 1770.

"DEAR BELOVED BRETHREN,—As it has pleased God to send us, his poor unworthy creatures, into this remote corner of the world, to preach his everlasting Gospel, I trust you will bear us on your minds, and help us by your prayers to fulfil the ministry which we have received of the Lord. We are at present far from you; and whether we shall ever be permitted to see you

---

* This is a mistake. It would not hold more than a third of that number. Mr. Whitefield sometimes commits similar errors. In one place he speaks of preaching to "five or six thousand" in the Old South Church in Boston. This ancient church is yet standing, and modern slips have since been substituted for its old-fashioned square pews, thereby increasing its capacity to accommodate a congregation; and it is found that it now contains but a few more than twelve hundred sittings! I am inclined to think, however, that this passage in Mr. Boardman's letter is a typographical error, and that the original read "seven" instead of "seventeen" hundred.

again in the body, God only knows. However, though we are absent from you, yet we are present with you; and I hope we shall continue so united, that

'Neither joy, nor grief, nor time, nor place,
Nor life, nor death can part.'

It was a great trial to us to leave our native land, more especially to leave our fellow-labourers in the Gospel, who were more dear to us than all the beauties of the British isles. Dear brethren, I feel you present while I write. But O, the Atlantic is between. O, this state of trial—this state of mutability. But where am I wandering? This is not our home. This is not our rest. After a little while, we shall rest,

'Where angels gather immortality,
And momentary ages are no more.'

Our coming to America has not been in vain. The Lord has been pleased to bless our feeble attempts to advance his kingdom in the world. Many have believed the report, and unto some the arm of the Lord has been revealed. There seems to be a shaking among the dry bones; and they come together, that God may breathe upon them. Our congregations are large, and we have the pious of most congregations to hear us, which makes the bigots mad. But we are fully determined not to retaliate. They may contend for that which God never revealed, and we will 'contend for the faith once delivered to the saints.' The religion of Jesus is a favourite topic in New-York. Many of the gay and polite speak much about grace and perseverance. But whether they would follow Christ, in 'sheep-skins and goat-skins,' is what I cannot affirm; nevertheless, there are some who are alive to God. Even some of the poor despised children of Ham are striving 'to wash their robes and to make them white in the blood of the Lamb.' We have a number of black women who meet together every week, many of whom are happy in the love of God. This evinces the truth of the apostle's assertion, 'that God is no respecter of persons; but in every nation he that feareth God and worketh righteousness is accepted of him.' The society here consists of about a hundred members, besides probationers; and I trust it will soon increase much more abundantly.

"Brother Boardman and I are chiefly confined to the cities, and, therefore, cannot at present go much into the country, as we have much more work upon our hands than we are able to perform. There is work enough for two preachers in each place; and if two of our brethren would come over, I believe it would be attended with a blessing, for then we could visit the places adjacent to the cities, which we cannot pretend to do, till we can take care of them. They need not be afraid of wanting the comforts of life, for the people are very hospitable and kind. When we came over, we put ourselves and the brethren to a great expense, being strangers to the country and people. But the case is now different, as matters are settled, and everything is provided. If you can send them over, we shall gladly provide for them. And I hope, in a few years, the brethren here will be able to send them back to England, according to the appointment of the conference. I am, dearly beloved brethren, yours inviolably, J. PILLMORE.

"P. S. I have in general been pretty well since I arrived here, and I hope this climate will agree with me; but I have very great trials, and humbly desire that all the brethren would pray for me."

Messrs. Boardman and Pillmore continued a regular interchange of labours between Philadelphia and New-York, which were much

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

blessed of the Lord, and of which the former again writes to Mr. Wesley:—

"New-York, *April* 23, 1771.

"Reverend Sir,—It pleases God to carry on his work among us. Within this month we have had a great awakening here. Many begin to believe the report, and to some the arm of the Lord is revealed. This last month we have had near thirty added to the society; five of whom have received a clear sense of the pardoning love of God. We have in this city some of the best preachers, both in the English and Dutch Churches, that are in America; yet God works by whom he will work.

"I have lately been much comforted by the death of some poor negroes, who have gone off the stage of time, rejoicing in the God of their salvation. I asked one on the point of death, 'Are you afraid to die?' 'O, no,' said she, 'I have my blessed Saviour in my heart. I should be glad to die. I want to be gone, that I may be with him forever. I know that he loves me, and I love him with all my heart.' She continued to declare the great things God had done for her soul, to the astonishment of many, till the Lord took her to himself. Several more seem just ready to be gone, longing for the happy time when mortality shall be swallowed up of life.

"I bless God, I find, in general, my soul happy though much tried and tempted; and though I am often made to groan, oppressed with unbelief, yet I find an increasing degree of love to God, his people, and his ways. But I want more purity of intention to aim at his glory, in all I think, speak, or do. 'Lord, I believe; help thou my unbelief.'

"We do not, dear sir, forget to pray for you, that God would lengthen out your days; nor can we help praying that you may see America before you die. Perhaps I have promised myself too much, when I have thought of this. 'Lord, not my will, but thine be done.' I am, dear sir, your affectionate son in the Gospel, R. Boardman."

Among the early pioneers of American Methodism, Robert Williams also deserves honourable mention. Like Embury and Strawbridge, he was also a local preacher from Ireland. About the time of the appointment of Messrs. Boardman and Pillmore, being desirous to emigrate to America, Mr. Wesley gave him a written license to labour under their direction in this country. Having made an engagement to sail in company with a friend by the name of Ashton, upon receiving intelligence that he was about to embark, being single and unencumbered with a family, and with no important business to settle, he immediately hastened to the place of embarkation, sold the horse on which he rode to pay his debts, and at once went on shipboard, depending upon his friend to pay his passage, who generously met the bill.

He probably landed in New-York, and before the arrival of the regular missionaries, as he was preaching in that city when Mr. Boardman arrived to take charge of the society in that place. He immediately departed to visit Mr. Pillmore, in Philadelphia, who encouraged him to devote himself exclusively to the work in America. This advice, which was followed, was productive of the most happy

consequences. He soon after went into Maryland and preached in several places, being the second Wesleyan preacher who laboured in that province in which Methodism, thus early introduced, has since assumed a position of so much influence and importance. He was also the pioneer of Methodism in Virginia, having first introduced it into Norfolk in the beginning of 1772. The year following he broke ground on the old Brunswick Circuit, where occurred the first general revival under the Methodists on this continent, and which had previously commenced under the labours of the Rev. Mr. Jarratt, with whom Mr. Williams coöperated as a most efficient and dilligent fellow-labourer. Mr. Jarratt, in a letter to Mr. Rankin, describes him as "a plain, artless, and indefatigable preacher." We shall hear more of him in the course of the history of American Methodism.

The name of John King also deserves a place in this list of worthies. He was from London, and arrived in this country at the close of 1769; but without any authority to preach. He soon after waited upon Mr. Pillmore in Philadelphia, and desired permission to exercise his gifts in the society. This Mr. Pillmore, not being then satisfied with his qualifications, declined to grant. But so desirous was he to proclaim the riches of free grace, that he appointed a meeting in the Potter's Field, upon his own responsibility. Some members of the society hearing him, upon this occasion, and being pleased with his promising appearance, desired Mr. Pillmore that he might be encouraged. After examination, he was permitted to preach a trial sermon; and as he appeared to be a young man of piety and zeal, and much engaged for God, he received permission from Mr. Pillmore to go down to Wilmington, Delaware, where Methodism had already been introduced, and to exhort among a few awakened persons who were earnestly seeking the Lord.

Subsequently he was sent into Maryland to labour in conjunction with Messrs. Strawbridge and Williams. It was about this time that Methodism was introduced into Baltimore, and a good work commenced in several other places. Mr. King was admitted afterward as a regular travelling preacher, and was a member of the first conference of 1773. He diligently laboured on various circuits in New-Jersey, Virginia, and North Carolina, till 1777, when in that dark period of our denominational, as well as national history, he located. He was a truly pious, zealous, and useful man, and so continued till his death, which occurred a few years since, at a very advanced age, in the vicinity of Raleigh, N. C. He was probably the only survivor, at the time of his decease, of all the preachers of ante-Revolutionary date. He is often mentioned by Bishop Asbury

in his Journals under the initials of J. K. He is the person to whom Mr. Wesley addressed that letter so often quoted, No. 308, Works, vol. vii, p. 13, and which I here insert:—

> "NEAR LEEDS, *July* 28, 1775.
>
> "MY DEAR BROTHER,—Always take advice or reproof as a favour: it is the surest mark of love.
>
> "I advised you once, and you took it as an affront: nevertheless, I will do it once more.
>
> "Scream no more, at the peril of your soul. God now warns you by me, whom he has set over you. Speak as earnestly as you can; but do not scream. Speak with all your heart; but with a moderate voice. It was said of our Lord, 'He shall not *cry*:' the word properly means, He shall not *scream*. Herein be a follower of me, as I am of Christ. I often speak loud; often vehemently; but I never scream; I never strain myself; I dare not: I know it would be a sin against God and my own soul. Perhaps one reason why that good man, Thomas Walsh, yea, and John Manners too, were in such grievous darkness before they died, was, because they shortened their own lives.
>
> "O John, pray for an advisable and teachable temper! By nature you are very far from it: you are stubborn and headstrong. Your last letter was written in a very wrong spirit. If you cannot take advice from others, surely you might take it from Your affectionate brother."

Among those who prepared the way for the introduction and success of Methodism on this continent was the Rev. Devereux Jarratt. He was powerfully converted to God when a lad, while a student under that distinguished man and father of Presbyterianism in Virginia, President Davies, who was probably instrumental in this happy change. He subsequently resolved to devote himself to the work of the ministry, studied theology, went to England for orders, and was settled in the parish of Bath, in Dinwiddie County, Virginia. Some others, like the Rev. Mr. Stringer of Philadelphia, and Dr. M'Gaw, of Delaware, were friendly, and sometimes attended and assisted in the meetings of the Methodists; but Mr. Jarratt was the only one of all the colonial clergy, who, like Mr. Fletcher and some others in England, actively and extensively coöperated with the Methodists in their evangelical labours. Of his settlement in the ministry, and of the commencement of that great work of grace of which he was the chief and honoured instrument until the Methodist preachers came to his help, he gives the following account in a letter to Mr. Rankin, which was afterward transmitted to Mr. Wesley:—

> "August 29, 1763, I was chosen rector of B., in the county of D., in Virginia. Ignorance of the things of God, profaneness, and irreligion, then prevailed among all ranks and degrees; so that I doubt if even the form of godliness was to be found in any one family of this large and populous parish. I was a stranger to the people; my doctrines were quite new to them, and were neither preached nor believed by any other clergyman, so far as I could learn, throughout the province.

"My first work was, to explain the depravity of our nature; our fall in Adam, and all the evils consequent thereon; the impossibility of being delivered from them by anything which we could do, and the necessity of a living faith in order to our obtaining help from God. While I continued to insist upon these truths, and on the absolute necessity of being born again, no small outcry was raised against this way, as well as against him that taught it. But by the help of God, I continued to witness the same to both small and great.

"The common people, however, frequented the church more constantly, and in larger numbers than usual. Some were affected at times, so as to drop a tear. But still, for a year or more, I perceived no lasting effect, only a few were not altogether so profane as before. I could discover no heart-felt convictions of sin, no deep or lasting impression of their lost estate. Indeed I have reason to believe that some have been a good deal alarmed at times. But they were shy of speaking to me (thinking it would be presumption) till their convictions wore off.

"But in the year 1765, the power of God was more sensibly felt by a few. These were constrained to apply to me, and inquire, 'What they must do to be saved?' And now I began to preach abroad, as well as in private houses; and to meet little companies in the evenings, and converse freely on divine things. I believe some were this year converted to God, and thenceforth the work of God went slowly on.

"The next year I became acquainted with Mr. M'R.,* rector of a neighbouring parish; and we joined hand in hand in the great work. He laboured much therein; and not in vain. A remarkable power attended his preaching, and many were truly converted to God, not only in his parish, but in other parts where he was called to labour.

"In the years 1770 and 1771 we had a more considerable outpouring of the Spirit, at a place in my parish called White Oak. It was here I first formed the people into a society; that they might strengthen and assist each other. The good effects of this were soon apparent. Convictions were deep and lasting; and not only knowledge, but faith, and love, and holiness, continually increased.

"In the year 1772 the revival was more considerable, and extended itself, in some places, for fifty or sixty miles around. It increased still more in the following year, and several sinners were truly converted to God. In the spring of 1774 it was more remarkable than ever. The word preached was attended with such energy, that many were pierced to the heart. Tears fell plentifully from the eyes of the hearers, and many were constrained to cry out. A goodly number were gathered in this year, both in my parish, and in many of the neighbouring counties. I formed several societies out of those who were convinced or converted; and I found it a happy means of building up those that had believed, and preventing the rest from losing their convictions.

"In the counties of Sussex, and in Brunswick, the work from the year 1773 was chiefly carried on by the labours of the people called Methodists. The first of them that appeared in these parts was Mr. Robert Williams, who, you know, was a plain, artless, indefatigable preacher of the Gospel. He was greatly blessed in detecting the hypocrite, razing false foundations, and stirring up believers to press after present salvation from the remains of sin. He came to my house in the month of March, in the year 1773.

"The next year others of his brethren came, who gathered many societies, both in this neighbourhood and in other places, as far as North Carolina. They now began to ride the circuit, and to take care of the societies already formed, which was rendered a happy means both of deepening, and spreading the work of God."†

---

* M'Roberts.

† Asbury's Journals, vol. i, pp. 158, 159.

And yet this extensive revival, thus commenced by an Episcopal clergyman, which continued with almost unabated power for more than twelve years, in which thousands of souls were transformed by the power of divine grace, and which was probably the only one which occurred in the whole history of the colonial Church in the Old Dominion, is not mentioned by Dr. Hawks in his history of the Protestant Episcopal Church in Virginia, although Mr. Jarratt himself often is. As the doctor was a most industrious collector of materials for his book, it is hardly possible that he was ignorant of it; and yet, while he mentions many comparatively trivial and unimportant matters, which are related with great particularity of detail, this great work is completely ignored.

The possessor of a name of still greater historical celebrity—that most eloquent and distinguished of modern preachers, the Rev. George Whitefield—by his most extensive and successful labours also did much to prepare the way of the Wesleyan Methodists on this continent. Landing on our shores in May, 1738, the very month that the Wesleys received justifying faith, (for he was actually in Christ before his teachers,) he crossed the wide Atlantic no less than thirteen times on his mission of love to the dwellers on this western continent. On several of these visits he travelled from Georgia to Maine, preaching to immense and enthusiastic multitudes, who were moved by his powerful appeals "as the trees of the wood are moved by a mighty wind."

On the second of these visits, that of 1744, he remained in the country between three and four years. "The great awakening" was now at its height, and he was incessant and indefatigable in his labours. Although many, as elsewhere, "contradicted and blasphemed," yet many also "received the word with joy." Extraordinary success attended him. The abundant fruits of his most efficient labours were mostly garnered by the Puritans of New-England, and the Presbyterians of the middle colonies, by whom he was received as an angel of God, as indeed he was; and for which they received a rich reward.

Mr. Whitefield did not form any societies of his own in America. He was not here the founder of a sect. God seems not to have sent him to plant Churches, but simply "to preach the Gospel." For the former he had no tact; but for the latter he possessed extraordinary qualifications; and well and truly did he perform the special work assigned him. In New-England, wherever the regular clergy (and this was the case with a party among them) did not coöperate with him and his friends in their labours, nor favour the work of which he was the chief promoter and representative, God raised up, as in

Europe, pious but illiterate preachers, by whom separate congregations were formed in several places, and who were thence called Separatists. These humble pastors with their flocks, as is usually the case, were generally opposed by their brethren. But they continued to hold up the torch of truth, and to maintain their testimony in favour of the new birth, until another people came to enforce this glorious doctrine with far greater ability, and with more abundant success.

The Baptists in this country are also largely indebted to the labours of Mr. Whitefield; for as they have always distinctly maintained the doctrine of the new birth, and have made it a requisite for baptism and admission to the Church, a part of these Separate congregations embraced their peculiarities and joined them in mass; and some of them remain in a flourishing state to this day. The stock, also, from which the Baptists in Virginia, now so numerous and influential, and in all the South, and from whence they have extended into the west and southwest, are of Whitefieldian descent.* The other principal branch of their family in the United States, the Freewill Baptists, had also the same origin, Benjamin Randall, their founder, and who formed their first Church in New-Durham, New-Hampshire, in 1780, but two years after Mr. Whitefield's death, being one of his converts.

Although Mr. Whitefield formed no Churches of his own, his herculean efforts were far from being lost. The labours of no one man, save those of Wesley alone, have exerted so mighty an influence upon the religious interests and destiny of these United States, as those of George Whitefield. His own biographers and friends seem not to be aware of the vast amount of good which he accomplished.

When the Methodist preachers came into New-England, nearly a quarter of a century after the death of Mr. Whitefield, they found some of these Separate Churches still in existence, by whom they were well received. A gentleman who was once a member of the Irish Conference under Mr. Wesley was induced to become the pastor of one of these Churches, over which he presided with great efficiency for nearly half a century. It is now one of the largest and most wealthy Congregationalist Churches in New-England; and out of it members have gone to assist in building up the Methodist Churches in the city in which it is located.†

Indeed, all who had heard Whitefield with affection, and especially those who had been blessed by his useful labours, in those cases in which they were not too strongly tinctured with Calvinism,

---

* Benedict's History of Baptists.

† The Benevolent Congregationalist Church, Providence, Rhode Island.

immediately recognised the peculiar doctrines which he preached, and especially the spirit by which he was actuated, in the teachings of the Methodists; and hence they generally received, and "heard them gladly." An illustration of this fact occurs in the Life of the Rev. F. Garrettson, p. 80, where, giving an account of his introduction to Methodism and the formation of a flourishing society in Quantico, Somerset County, on the eastern shore of Maryland, he says:—

> "Old Mr. and Mrs. Rider, who were on a visit among their friends, heard me preach, and were much affected. After the congregation was dismissed, they advanced toward me in tears, and the old lady spoke as follows:—'Many years ago we heard Mr. Whitefield preach, and we were brought to taste the sweetness of religion. Till we heard you, we had not heard a Gospel sermon for about twenty years. The first time I heard you preach, I knew it was the truth, but I only had a little spark left. Yesterday we heard you again, and the little spark was blown up to a coal; and, glory to God! to-day the coal is blown up to a flame. We cannot hide ourselves any longer from you; our house and hearts are open to receive you and the blessed word you preach.' The dear old people seemed to see, feel, and think alike. I went to their house, and it appeared as if there were many in that vicinity just ripe for the Gospel. O! there was a sweet gathering to the fold of Jesus."

Thus did this indefatigable evangelist act as the mighty pioneer of the Methodists in the New World.

Soon after his arrival, upon his last visit to this country, he wrote the following pious letter, so characteristic of the man, to the Rev. C. Wesley. This is the last letter he ever wrote to Charles; and although he says in the postscript, "I hope to write to your honoured brother soon," yet it is presumable that it is the last he ever wrote to either of these distinguished brothers. It is dated from his orphan House:—

> "Bethesda, *January* 15*th*, 1770.
>
> "My Very Dear old Friend,—I wrote to your honoured brother, from on board ship. Since then what wonders have I seen! what innumerable mercies have I received! a long, trying, but, I hope, profitable passage. My poor, feeble labours are owned in Charlestown; and everything is more promising than in Georgia. The increase of this once-so-much despised colony is incredible. Good, I trust, is doing in Savannah, and Bethesda is like to blossom as a rose: the situation is most delightful, very salubrious, and everything excellently adapted for the intended purpose. All admire the goodness, strength and beauty of the late improvements. In a few months the intended plan, I hope, will be completed, and a solid, lasting foundation laid for the support and education of many, as yet unborn. Nothing is wanted but a judicious and moderately learned, single-hearted master. Surely the glorious Emmanuel will point out one in his own due time. Do pray. I am sure, prayers put up above thirty years ago are now answering; and I am persuaded, we shall yet see greater things than these. Who would have thought that such a worthless creature as this letter-writer should live to be fifty-five years old? I can only sit down and cry, 'What hath God wrought!' My

bodily health is much improved, and my soul is on the wing for a northern Gospel range."*

In this, which proved to be his last "Northern Gospel Range," he called upon Messrs. Boardman and Pillmore in Philadelphia, and expressing to them the great satisfaction which he felt in seeing the children of his old friend and fellow-labourer on this side of the Atlantic, he encouraged them to proceed in their work.

Having passed through the colonies, on his last northern tour, proclaiming to multitudes the riches of grace, in his usual manner, he was just on his return, when he preached his last sermon in Exeter, New-Hampshire, standing upon a hogshead near the meeting-house. His text was 2 Cor. xiii, 5: "Examine yourselves, whether ye be in the faith." He spoke with great animation and power; a fitting close for such a life. After the sermon, he rode to Newburyport, Massachusetts, where he was to preach the next day, and took lodgings with the Rev. Mr. Parsons, pastor of the First Presbyterian Church in that ancient town. On the road, he complained of an attack of the asthma, to which he was subject; "but," said he, "another pulpit sweat or two will cure me." But, alas! this master of assemblies was to take no more pulpit-sweats. In the course of the night the attack so increased in violence as to occasion great distress, and compel him to rise and approach a window for the sake of fresh air. His friend and travelling companion, Mr. Smith, also rose to assist him. All the usual appliances for this painful disease were employed, but without effect. His last foe was marching upon him apace, and this veteran "soldier of the cross," this hero of a thousand battles, prepared to meet him with becoming dignity and resolution. Presuming that his end was approaching, he now broke forth in fervent prayer for the whole world in general, and for his Orphan House, in Georgia, in particular, for the support of which he had made such great exertions, both in Europe and America, and the destitute and helpless occupants of which were ever near his heart; and then, withal, requested that if his work was now done on earth, the Lord would be pleased to take him to himself. Then falling into the arms of his attendant, he peacefully breathed out his last, September 30th, 1770, in the fifty-sixth year of his age, and the thirty-fifth of his ministry—yet comparatively young in years, but aged in labours and in usefulness. The next day, which was the Sabbath, the country people came pouring into town for the purpose of again listening to this most eloquent of preachers. But that mighty and quickening voice, to the music of which they had so often listened with profit and delight, and which had been the instrument of

---

* Jackson's Life of C. Wesley, pp. 619, 620.

salvation to so many thousands, in both hemispheres, was now hushed in death; and in silent grief and amazement the multitudes returned to their homes, and the church was shrouded in mourning, that one of her mightiest champions had fallen. In accordance with his request, that his early friend should perform this service for him, Mr. Wesley preached his funeral sermon in Mr. Whitefield's two chapels in London, on the 18th of the following November, from Num. xxiii, 10: "Let me die the death of the righteous, and let my last end be like his."

The First Presbyterian Church in Newburyport was formed as one of the results of Mr. Whitefield's labours, during some of his earliest visits to this country, and their meeting-house, a large structure which is yet standing, was erected in 1756. He had so often enjoyed such glorious divine manifestations while preaching in that house, that several years before his death he told his friends, that if he should die in that part of the world, he wished to be buried under its pulpit. His Newburyport friends remembered this request, so agreeable to their own feelings, and now had it in their power to grant it. Accordingly, although the people of Boston, where he had preached to overflowing audiences, and among whom he was immensely popular, requested the privilege of having his dust rest with them, they were refused; they prepared a vault under the pulpit where they laid him. His friend, the Rev. Mr. Parsons, at whose house he died, and also a subsequent pastor of the Church, the Rev. Mr. Prince, who was a blind preacher, when dying, requested to be laid by his side, which was done; and the three now sleep together in peace. The Rev. Jesse Lee, who visited the tomb about the year 1791, says that the process of putrefaction had then even scarcely commenced, and that the flesh was quite firm and hard. This is now no longer the case, however. When I visited it in 1833 it was quite decayed, and one of the arm bones had been abstracted by some sacrilegious relic hunter.

This church, thus identified with the history of a great man, and a name distinguished in ecclesiastical annals, stands on the corner of Federal and School-streets, and the parsonage in which he died, and which is also yet standing, is but a few rods distant in the former street. A few years since, this ancient church was remodelled inside, and the pulpit, together with the vault beneath, were removed from the side, where they formerly stood, after the fashion of the old New-England meeting-houses, to the end of the church. A beautiful marble cenotaph, at an expense of $1200, was erected on the right of the pulpit, by William Bartlett, Esq., a wealthy merchant of Newburyport, and the great benefactor of the Andover Theological School.

ART. II.—GERMAN GYMNASIA AND ENGLISH PUBLIC SCHOOLS.

[MODIFIED FROM JAHN'S JAHRBÜCHER.]

In the following paper we propose to invite the attention of our readers to a few observations upon the higher schools of two countries, where education has engrossed greater attention and patronage than throughout the world besides, and where the relative merits of every feasible system have been tested by a large and varied experience. England, with her five hundred public schools, endowed, for the most part, by the munificent liberality of her sovereigns or of private individuals, and Germany, with the generous rivalry of its governments in the establishment, protection, and regulation of the higher institutions of learning, are, notwithstanding the besotted ignorance of vast masses of their respective populations, more richly provided with the means of contributing to the true philosophy of education, than perhaps any or all other nations; and it is to their methods and institutions all must appeal, who, in any country, are honestly intent upon the improvement of existing systems of public education. Among the Germans, more particularly, the dictum of Plato, that "man cannot propose a higher and nobler object for his study than education, and all that appertains thereto," has obtained universal recognition, and their pedagogical knowledge and activity are certainly without parallel in the ancient or modern history of mankind. Distinguished instructors have been repeatedly sent forth at the public expense to travel in other lands, for the purpose of obtaining information respecting the organization of schools, and to investigate the merits of every foreign educational method.

For many years, in dealing with the most important questions of practical and social life, the Germans have been avowedly in the habit of directing special attention to a country, whose inhabitants, like their own swift ships, have noiselessly and steadily pursued the track observed for centuries; while others, with comparatively feeble craft, the sport of winds and currents, have been blown further and further from the goal of their wishes and exertions, to be driven at last, far from their reckoning, on to one-knows-not-what barbaric shore. England, who, with her fleets, as Rome formerly with her legions, sways the destinies of more than half the world, has remained unshaken and unperturbed amidst those violent convulsions which, during the last seven years, have caused the entire continent of Europe to tremble. In spite of her enormous proletariat, and the

extreme sensitiveness of her great industrial interests, which could not be unaffected by the feverish commotions and agitations of the rest of Europe, no threatening word has been uttered, no violent arm uplifted for the purpose of hastily or illegally redressing the multiform and deep ailments, under which society even there is languishing. A people so prominent by commercial activity, political eminence and literature, may well attract the deep interest of the intelligent and thoughtful in other lands, more particularly to those institutions which, from their especial office of calling forth and maintaining the higher mental culture, contribute more than all besides to the power and influence of a nation. As among the Germans, those who administer high political functions, or exert direct influence upon the government, have obtained their education almost without exception at the gymnasium and the university; so in England the queen's ministers, the peers, the officials, the bishops, clergy, and all who in parliament or out of it lay claim to high cultivation, are indebted for the possession of it to the public schools and universities. Since, then, the influence exerted by these establishments upon English civilization cannot be unimportant, and since under all imaginable circumstances the school not merely receives a bias from the world without, but also in its turn gives impulse and direction to the varied activities of life, it must certainly be profitable to obtain an accurate knowledge of the higher educational institutions of a country which it has become of late the fashion to describe as, *par excellence*, "the land of hereditary wisdom."

This task has been executed in a manner and to an extent that leaves little to be desired by an intelligent and accomplished German scholar, (Dr. Wiese,) who was commissioned in the summer of 1851 to proceed to England for the purpose of investigating the mechanism and actual performances of education there, and who has recently published the results of his observations in a highly instructive volume, entitled, "*Briefe über die Englische Erziehung.*" On the other hand, we have long been favoured in M. Victor Cousin's celebrated "*Rapport sur l'état de l'Instruction Publique dans quelques pays de l'Allemagne, et particulièrement en Prusse,*" with a detailed and lucid exposition of German education, from the elementary schools up to the universities, which, during a lengthened residence in Germany, the author enjoyed the most favourable opportunities of studying in all its bearings and departments. Both works are eminently deserving consideration, no less from the celebrity of their writers, than the impartiality of their judgments. While, then, it is one object of this paper to direct attention to their statements, it would seem instructive, and at the same time consistent with the end we have more immediately in view, to com-

pare the internal organization of the German gymnasia with that of the corresponding English public schools somewhat more fully than has been done in the letters, to which we owe our principal materials. In the execution of our design, we shall confine ourselves almost exclusively to a consideration of the end, the method, the subjects of instruction, and the discipline of the higher English, as contrasted with those of the German learned schools.

Amidst considerable diversity of detail, the end proposed by the public schools of England is essentially the same. Their design is to impart a liberal education, and so far is identical with that of the German gymnasia, from which, however, they differ in this respect, that the state has ordained the scope and purpose of the latter, and made them principally establishments for the education of such scholars as are destined to the learned professions or official employment, even in the case of those who have no intention of pursuing a higher and more strictly scientific course of study. In England a different system prevails. There the school is entirely unconnected with the state, and no claim or title to public preferment can be achieved by repairing to a public school or one of the national universities, and by obtaining honours at the examinations instituted at the latter. What is sought in entering these establishments is simply such an education as will enable the recipient to assume in future years, with respect more particularly to all that concerns his character and personal relations, the status of *a gentleman.* In pursuing this aim less labour is bestowed upon the acquisition of positive accomplishments or a scientific spirit, than upon vigorously exercising the mental powers, and communicating the ability to take a manly and independent position in society and calling. Not so much knowledge, as capability and conduct are sought to be imparted. For this reason the instruction given is exceedingly circumscribed, being limited in fact to what is thought best adapted to impart correct views and fixed principles, in the confident expectation that thoroughness in a few subjects, and the mental self-possession which this engenders, will confer upon the pupil in years of riper development and emancipation from control, the ability to comprehend and appreciate, as they may deserve, whatever subjects he may voluntarily select as the object of pursuit. By thus simplifying and cutting down the subjects of instruction, the danger to which the Germans are exposed of overburdening, unduly stimulating, and failing to concentrate the scholar's intellectual energies, is altogether avoided. The practice of compelling the young gymnasiast to devote his industry and attention to the successive preparation and recitation of from four to six lessons upon different sub-

[illegible]

jects must of necessity distract and weaken the mental force to a far greater extent than can happen in England, where the Bible, Greek, Latin, and mathematics, constitute the whole routine of study, and are considered sufficient to call forth that amount of intellectual effort which is requisite to the proper discipline of the mind and character.

With the foregoing exposition of the end they keep in view, the method pursued in the English schools entirely coincides. In the majority, instruction is continued for one hour and twenty minutes upon the same topic, and kindred studies are taken in rotation; the intermediate hours being appropriated to recreation, repetition, and the labor of preparation. In no single day are more than four, and in the same week, than eighteen hours, devoted to class exercises. The pupil is in this way led to acquire the habit of studying *privatim*, and in connexion therewith works daily during certain hours with his private tutor. The chief business of the teachers officially connected with the school consists in examining the boys upon the lessons previously given out, and in prescribing new ones. This is done in a large hall, in which usually all the classes are assembled; but if a teacher prefers to conduct the recitations of his pupils in a more private manner, he can be separated from the rest by a screen. The head-master, from an elevated desk or seat, overlooks all the classes. From these arrangements it is apparent that the mental labour of the boys is performed to a much greater extent at their private lodgings than in class. What is done in the latter relates to the more definite results of study. To a plain question a clear and accurate answer is expected, whereby necessity is laid upon the pupil, in reading, for example, a chapter of history, not to throw away his industry upon vague and round-about effort to apprehend the subject in its more general relations, but in the first instance at all events to concentrate his diligence upon a more specific aim. Wiese remarks that this system is pushed to such an extent as to become mechanical, and is so tenaciously adhered to as to induce the teacher studiously to avoid that æsthetical treatment of the subject of the lesson, which would give it attractiveness and grace. This, in his estimation, would be far too vague and treacherous a mode of dealing with the work in hand; he does not wish to make labour too interesting, and, on many occasions, gives deliberate preference to dry details, in order that by forcing the mind to dwell upon these, the important habit of patiently persevering under difficulties may be gained. Dry, too, are their sylloges or abstracts, without which scarcely any branch of learning is pursued. Their contents must be mechanically committed to memory; and whether

they are understood or not, is in their estimation almost a matter of indifference. The ability to comprehend what is thus acquired, they imagine will be gained at a subsequent period. In all this it is clear, that no effort is made to awaken, and, indeed, that little value is attached to that passionate eagerness for knowledge which the Germans desiderate in their scholars, or, at any rate, in those belonging to the upper classes. No inspiration is attempted to be imparted or cultivated, but merely the conscientious performance of a prescribed duty, and for this prizes of various kinds are distributed. Here, as in all other things, we observe the practical bias of English educational effort. An enthusiastic interest, which warms both the intellect and the heart, they care not to inspire, from a fear that it might check the uniform and steady development of the advancing reason, and imperil its equipoise by familiarizing it with merely general notions, or vague, indefinite results. Rather than expose the tyro to this risk, they permit him to sink into simple formalism, which, at all events, appears to furnish a valuable criterion for testing the precise amount of diligent effort he puts forth.

Among the subjects of instruction, whose specific importance and mode of treatment we proceed to consider, the two ancient languages occupy by far the most important place. They constitute, in truth, in connexion with the Bible, the strict *matériel* of English education—a healthy mental discipline being the object kept more especially in view in their reading and explanation. The instruction given in them is chiefly grammatical; but even in this respect is limited to what alone is deemed essential to a correct apprehension of an author's meaning, and to certainty in finding the exactly equivalent English expression. Mr. Wiese affirms, that he has failed to remark the same thoroughness and accuracy of grammatical definition which are required by his compatriots. In Germany, it is well known, the greatest pains are taken to explain as rationally as possible every peculiarity of language, and to bring them before the pupil, as far as this is practicable, in the most intelligible and philosophic form. In all this the English pedagogue is but little interested, provided only the given principle is intelligibly stated, and, when grasped, easy to be recalled on the occurrence of any illustration. Peculiar stress is laid upon this latter point, for herein he believes the exercise of the pupil's judgment to be preëminently called forth; and this opinion it is which induces him to rest satisfied with a method of procedure consecrated by tradition, and having in its favour the prestige derived from its having been in successful operation for centuries. Even in the reading of the upper classes, what is special and peculiar to the individual author is pressed preëmi-

nently upon the attention of the scholar. To what extent he penetrates into the spirit of the whole, say of a Greek tragedy or an Horatian ode—how far he may be said to attain a correct appreciation of his author in a linguistic, ethical, or other point of view—cannot be distinctly learned from Mr. Wiese's statements; but it would seem that, in these and similar requirements, no very great progress is achieved. Questions, for example, are proposed, which oblige him to observe narrowly certain peculiarities of a writer, either in respect of certain statements he makes, or forms of expression he adopts, and diligently to collate them. The same object is sought to be obtained by exercises in metre, which are pushed to a great extent. In these, again, the preliminary or initial steps are altogether mechanical, inasmuch as words taken quite indiscriminately and sometimes entirely at hap-hazard are ranged in juxtaposition for the mere purpose of making a verse. It is not, until a very much later period, that verses are formed, which yield a sense. In these preparatory lessons, the intention can only be that of not distracting the mind of the pupil, by requiring him to pay attention to the thought, from becoming thoroughly grounded in technicalities, and extremely ready in using his material; thus simplifying as much as possible his earliest attempts, and thereby rendering the exercise, which has only to do with prosody and metre, the more certain and easy of execution. In all things the English instructor starts apparently from the assumption, that every faculty of the understanding will act with a vigour proportioned to the one-sided and limited character of its training. At a later time, the pupil acquires, it is true, great ingenuity and skill, not merely in turning original compositions into verse, but also in Latin and Greek renderings of passages from Shakspeare, Milton, Byron, and other English poets. As a means of intellectual discipline, these exercises are of undeniable excellence, and in the consciousness of having gained the dexterity above alluded to, there lies a sense of power, which, as strengthening and developing character, cannot be too zealously promoted. In addition to these considerations, their successful performance demands a very intimate familiarity with the spirit and diction of the ancients, and compels the pupil to a laborious and attentive perusal of their writings. In this way, on the one hand, the pleasure he derives from his classical studies is considerably heightened, while, on the other, his powers of observation and strength of purpose are called into healthy play. To insure these objects, the quantity of a Greek or Latin classic appropriated to each lesson is small, consisting of a previously specified number of lines or verses. The "getting up," nevertheless, of these

moderate tasks must be thorough and exact; and while the choice of authors for private reading is left entirely to the pupil, it is still required that small portions should be taken at a time, and made, by frequent repetition, his own strict property.

Here, again, the great caution employed in guarding the scholar against distraction of his mental powers, and in teaching him to concentrate his energies upon the work in hand, is strikingly apparent. The principle is adhered to, tenaciously, of not exacting anything from him which in any way surpasses his capacity, in order that his intellectual activity may not be unduly tasked, or his success in study imperilled by any feeling of uncertainty. For this reason, the more profound appreciation of Greek and Latin writers, together with all critical investigation of their excellence and beauty is reserved for the university. In the first three years of academic study, the attention of the English student is, for the most part, occupied with a perusal of the ancient writers, which is conducted in a manner very similar to that pursued with the upper or middle classes of the gymnasium. By this arrangement, it is obvious that the English enjoy an important advantage over German teachers. The yearning of the latter is but too natural that their pupils—of whom they well know that it is only in exceptional instances, after leaving school, they revert of their own accord to the writings of Homer, Cicero, Tacitus, Sophocles, Demosthenes, or Plato—could be incited, by a more thorough examination into the intrinsic value and artistic superiority of the old classics, to appreciate in some degree, the spirit, originality, and grandeur of Greek and Roman philosophy. In striving after the realization of this wish, it must, however, be confessed that there is no slight danger of opening up to the boy, of, say from sixteen to twenty years of age, a sphere of thought, in which his untutored faculties are unable of themselves to discover the true track, and of crippling, or hopelessly embarrassing his mental energies in the effort to attain too high a goal. The English avoid this risk with greater certainty, inasmuch as the student, who has by this time arrived at man's estate, was not suffered, when at school, to make any onward advance, until his foot had been firmly planted on the preceding step of the intellectual ladder. While, then, the German teacher is but too apt to accelerate, somewhat prematurely, the progress of his pupil, in order that, by causing him to strain every nerve, he may place him upon a level with himself in knowledge, and not unfrequently pursues a course in which the exertion demanded amounts to over-tension of his energies; the English instructor insures the advancement of his classes by slow and equal steps, and is more certain than his rival can possibly be,

that none remain behind. Hence, it may readily be understood why a strictly classical education, and a profound veneration for the wisdom of antiquity are more generally met with in England than in Germany. The study of the dead languages and their literature, leaves its mark, it is true, upon the minds of all who have gone through the curriculum of the gymnasium; but a distinct and lively consciousness of the precise influence which classical studies have had in producing this impression, and of the way in which, by and through them, the understanding, judgment, taste, and general conceptions of nature and life are trained and enlarged, is just as little to be recognised among the majority, as a vivid and pleasant remembrance of the august and splendid creations of the ancient masters, which have been brought before their notice during the period of their attendance at the gymnasium. The reason of this, as it appears to us, may be discovered in the showy and superficial character of the programme adopted at these institutions, in virtue of which, the student, when just beginning to comprehend Livy and Virgil, quits the second class, and proceeds to the university, never again to look into Tacitus, Plato, or Thucydides, in the event of his being satisfied with the attainment of nothing more than a dim presentiment of the tragic spirit of the first, the ideas of the second, and the magnificent conflict of party principles described by the last of these great writers. In England it is widely different. The impression made by the ancient classic writers is far more persistent. They are pleasantly recalled to memory in after life, because in such reminiscences the painful sense of unrequited exertion, of the understanding struggling with mere form and engaged in the bootless attempt to comprehend matters transcending its capacity, does not disturbingly intermingle. They are taken up again and again, referred to constantly, and the practical sagacity of the reader leads him often enough to the discovery in their pages of instruction or support for the ever-varying circumstances of the times in which he lives.

To their own language, the English devote but little time or special instruction, considering translations from Latin and Greek into English, and back again from the latter into the two former languages, the best preparative for the correct employment of the mother tongue. These exercises are performed with a strictness which is almost painful, in order that the pupil may be enabled to estimate the exact force of every word, and discriminate between its various shades of meaning with the most minute precision. He is not suffered to rest content with the acquisition of mere stereotype or euphonious phraseology, or to be so far dazzled by the graces of

a neatly turned paraphrase, as to be unable to detect inaccuracy of expression, or to appreciate, distinctly, the full significance of what is said. Lessons in English composition are, therefore, of an exceedingly simple and practical character, being intended principally to develop the ability to note and register such statements as deal more particularly with matters of fact; the lesson, properly so called. being made to consist in the discrimination and comparison of some simple thought, establishing or amplifying its truth by the citation of analogous examples, and more especially in reproducing all that may have been read and canvassed during the hour of recitation.

Here, again, a definite quantity, amounting at Harrow to but forty lines, is prescribed as well for English as Latin composition. The importance which the Germans attach to originality and freedom of composition in their own language, is regarded in England as altogether out of place; and tasks, whose performance is exacted from tertians, or pupils in the third form of the gymnasium, it is considered almost criminal to require from English boys. Of intellectual production, it is generally thought that little should be looked for or required at an age which possesses, merely, capacity and adaptedness for gathering information and acquiring a turn of mind, through which, whatever creative power the intellect possesses, may be developed with due carefulness and certainty. In this particular, beyond all doubt, the Germans may derive a useful lesson from their more practical rivals, whose style of prose-writing leaves, generally speaking, nothing to be desired in point of clearness and originality. In German composition, tasks are often given to the pupil which the tutor knows beforehand cannot be executed in such a manner as the subject in itself demands, the opinion being entertained, that if they are only performed in a way which corresponds to some extent with the mental stand-point of the scholar, they will still be profitable exercises, and contribute to the advancement of his capabilities of thought and expression.

Here, again, as it seems to us, it is erroneously assumed that high requirements will, of themselves, elevate the pupil's intellectual range; and that although his performance may, as a general rule, fall short of what might be desired, his perceptions cannot fail, in many cases, to be heightened; and even when it is discovered that he has brought forward as his own and incorporated into his thesis, upon the authority of his teacher or text-book, facts and statements whose accuracy he has taken no pains to test, or to make his own intellectual property, (for in truth they lie beyond the sphere of his own experimental knowledge,) it is considered alike natural and innocuous. Without seeking to affirm that the tyro should insert nothing

in his composition with which he is not himself thoroughly conversant, or which in its more profound relations he does not completely understand, we nevertheless believe, that to insure sound mental progress, it is our duty to see to it, that whatever essential matter he may have derived, not from his own attainment and observation, but from the authority of others, laborious collation during recitation, or the explanations of his instructor, should be excluded from his essay. Let the teacher enjoin upon him the performance of tasks of the character we have named, and he will be betrayed into self-deception as to his own mental progress—will suppose himself to understand, or, perhaps, to have discovered, what he merely repeats upon extrinsic testimony, and regard as his own what in reality he is only borrowing from others. Of this objectionable class are exercises which are based upon a profoundly experimental knowledge of human life, the inner course and development of history, the higher relations of antiquity, the subtle allusions or profound ideas shadowed forth in the master-pieces of modern poetry, and other subjects of the same order which we meet with so frequently in the programmes of German gymnasia. If the object sought is mainly that of grasping the most approved form of expression, of acquiring a logical, accurate, and elegant method of arrangement and statement, it will be realized with much less uncertainty, when the pupil is fully equal to his theme, and can at a glance take in and master all its details, than when, with a kind of mental *echauffement*, he has first to elaborate thought from the dry *matériel*, and then reduce it to proper shape. In these German compositions we frequently perceive not so much exercises in form as in thinking, as if the notion were, that only in writing German the faculty of thought is to be taxed, and that in the classics and mathematics but little scope, comparatively speaking, is afforded for its exercise. Mental labour of the kind exacted in these essays, whose subjects are so exceedingly diversified, is unquestionably an accomplishment of riper years, and more extensive attainments.

In the modern languages, the pupil is carried no further in the public schools of England than in the gymnasia of Germany, neither French nor German being so acquired as their use in living intercourse demands. Nor in truth is any eagerness displayed for the possession of these accomplishments, owing mainly to the persuasion that in the dead languages the precise point to which the scholar has advanced can always be ascertained with great exactitude, from the possibility of finding in both of them a form of expression whereby his thought may be enunciated with the utmost clearness and precision; while, in the modern, the precise idea that may be

sought to be conveyed, in innumerable instances, transcends the particular phraseology in which usage permits it to be clothed. From this circumstance, it happens that the acquisition of the languages of modern Europe is, in great part, a simple exercise of memory, although, to some extent, involving a degree of intelligence which is not ordinarily enjoyed by a boy or youth. In England, therefore, the labour of obtaining an intimate familiarity with their use as an instrument of thought or conversation, is abandoned to opportunities outside the school.

On the value of mathematics as a means of educational training, widely different opinions, as Mr. Wiese informs us, are still put forth in the English periodicals. To Americans, who, with the French and Germans, have long conceded to these studies a prominent place in their schools, and believe them to possess an importance which no other kind of intellectual discipline possesses in like degree, it will perhaps appear unaccountable, that in industrial and commercial England it should still be gravely debated whether the mathematics exert any influence in developing mental power; and if so, to what extent. One party affirms that no education can be called liberal which does not develop the *vis logica* as well as the *copia dicendi*, and accordingly place mathematical attainments upon the same level with classical accomplishments. To this their opponents reply, that the study of the classics no less insures the efficient cultivation of the purely logical faculties; and that a mere mathematician, inasmuch as, in point of fact, he is nothing else than a machine for the performance of certain operations connected with the science of number, can by no means be pronounced a cultivated man, in the higher sense of that expression. If what has just been stated may be considered the epitome of all that is urged on one or the other side of this question, it would really seem that the opposing parties deal their blows without any serious design of even so much as hitting one another. The study of the languages enjoys this great advantage over every other branch of education, that, of all the faculties of the human understanding, it leaves none inactive and untaxed. While, however, language, in a dialectic form, admits a certain freedom, as well in the choice of the expression—*i. e.*, in the form of the idea—as in the arrangement of ideas in smaller or larger groups, the mathematical sciences enforce a strict and necessary progression, and consequently furnish a wholesome, and to many mental idiosyncrasies, an absolutely indispensable supplement to the benefit derivable from philological studies, by habituating the mind, naturally discursive and prone to wander, to a precise and logical mode of thought; to say nothing of the fact, that some acquaintance with the relations of space

and number can in no way be dispensed with by an educated man. Moreover, the study of mathematics, although still occupying a very subordinate position in their curriculum, has already gained an entrance into the majority of English schools, or, at all events, into such as possess a full corps of properly qualified instructors. The natural sciences, however, have not yet been introduced into the public schools, on account of their being regarded as subjects which pertain exclusively to certain professional occupations. The English believe that boys are incapable of employing themselves profitably with their investigation; and that, like the modern languages, however important they may be for the purposes of practical life, they include but little which can assist in moulding the human mind for its proper destination. In their opinion, the school has fulfilled its duty, if it has developed a capability of observation and judgment in the mind of the pupil, which, when inclination leads him to engage his attention with these departments of knowledge, will render him fully equal to their comprehension and investigation. In the High School of Edinburgh, chemistry and geology appear upon the programme, although the instruction in these sciences is resigned to professors in the University. When first introduced, a few zealous pupils applied themselves to these studies, which they subsequently abandoned, although teachers of preëminent ability in both departments were provided. For what reasons the authorities were induced to commence with geology and chemistry, rather than the leading principles of physics, is a point on which Mr. Wiese imparts no information; but it may fairly be surmised that an explanation of those phenomena which present themselves to our notice everywhere in nature, would have proved much more acceptable.

Perhaps it may be assumed that the Englishman is, in general, disposed to look at nature from a utilitarian point of view, and is, therefore, justified in excluding the natural sciences from his educational system. The German, on the contrary, in accordance with his philosophical predilections and mental idiosyncrasy, strives to grasp nature in its deeper relations with God and humanity. Hence it occupies, even in his estimation, a closer and more intimate connexion with his whole intellectual life, than it would seem to sustain in the apprehension of the English, and consequently, in the education given at the gymnasium, which aspires to provide mental pabulum for the entire man, cannot remain without a place. Instruction in these branches must nevertheless be limited—in order that the tyro may not be completely overwhelmed by the multiplicity of subjects claiming his attention—to such details as are most essential, and will furnish a stimulus to more comprehensive study at an after period.

Instruction in history is, by no means, universally admitted into the English public schools. Where it is given, it consists, simply, of familiar directions as to the proper mode of reading good historical works, in which examinations are subsequently held, the hour appropriated to this exercise being the same as that devoted to the perusal of Herodotus, Thucydides, Livy, and Tacitus. This statement applies equally to modern history, for which the elementary books of Mignet, Guizot, Markham, Russell, and other writers, are most generally employed. To the labour of communicating a systematic and continuous knowledge of universal history, no claim or pretension whatever is set up. All that is attempted here, is to render the pupil thoroughly conversant with the details of some particular historical period, everything over and above this being left to his own private reading, for which very excellent text-books are provided. With respect to these publications, it may be remarked, that although the Germans have expended much care and labour in the preparation of similar manuals, the best informed of their teachers have long been desirous that the day may soon arrive, in which quasi-professional lectures upon history will be banished altogether from the gymnasium, and when those holding appointments in these institutions will rest satisfied with giving *viva voce* instruction in a few leading divisions of ancient and modern history, of such a character as may be best adapted to the intellectual standpoint of the scholar, and abandon all beyond this to elementary abstracts or syllogies, whose contents shall in the first instance be committed to memory, and afterward repeated periodically in paragraphs of moderate length. Sympathizing most cordially with this wish, it does appear to us that the perpetual complaints we hear from teachers respecting the insufficiency of the time allotted for mastering the enormous material of history, have no substantial foundation, and are to be ascribed to an incorrect apprehension of the task imposed upon those who teach it in the gymnasium.

Religious instruction in the English school is confined almost entirely to the study of the Bible. The New Testament and certain parts of the Septuagint are read in Greek without any minute or exact interpretation. No special lectures upon the principal dogmata of Christian faith and morals, or even upon ecclesiastical history, are delivered. Whatever information is to be acquired by the pupil respecting these subjects, is to be drawn from reading the Scriptures, and is closely connected with this duty. Religion, indeed, is never dealt with in the school as a science, but is discussed from a purely practical point of view. The idea of an exclusively Christian gymnasium, which has been of late so much dis-

cussed in Germany, could not by possibility, according to Mr. Wiese, have had an English origin. To classical antiquity, the English stand in a perfectly naïve relation; it never enters into their heads that any blow can be inflicted upon Christianity from this quarter. A deep gulf, in their judgment, separates the two regions. If this representation is really true, we perceive at once how essentially different is the character of the German from that of the Englishman. Were the latter inclined or competent to grapple as closely, on the one hand, with Christianity, and on the other with the old classic literature, as the German, he would find the attempt to place between the two worlds a wall of partition so insurmountable altogether impossible. Even those among the Germans, who profeſs publicly their adherence to an entirely one-sided and partial view of revelation, will not mistake or refuse to acknowledge the clear and palpable path which conducts from the ancient classical to the Christian world. The one receives its true illumination only from the other, and the historical development and temporal bearings of the Christian religion can in no way be understood, without a knowledge of antiquity. If, then, the two at certain points are in such close contact with each other, it is of course quite possible that the ideas peculiar to the Christian system may receive, by injudicious treatment, a colouring from the influence of the Pagan cultus, which may have a very prejudicial effect upon the impressionable mind of the boy. That this danger does not at all exist in England, can only happen from the fact that the Anglican, in a similar spirit to the Roman Catholic Church, and in accordance with the universally practical tendencies of the national character, pays more regard to the mere externals of Christianity than German Protestantism. In this opinion we shall feel ourselves still more strengthened by considering more attentively, as we now proceed to do, the way and manner in which the English treat the subject of moral education.

And here we must observe, that their public schools are educational establishments in a different sense from the German gymnasia. Boarding houses for the pupils are connected with the latter only in exceptional cases, while in England this is almost universally the established practice, there being no exception in the instance of the more celebrated schools. Somewhere about the twelfth year of their age, boys are dismissed from the family circle, in order to be withdrawn from the noisy life of the town, the temptations and distractions of miscellaneous society, the indulgence of the parental roof, and handed over to quiet rooms in private and secluded houses, there to undergo a stricter discipline and more earnest mental

training. While the Germans regard these "alumnate" as a makeshift for boys, whose parents have not time, inclination, or aptitude for the superintendence of their education, and every father, who loves his son, prefers, when circumstances permit his doing so, to retain him under his own roof, in order to deprive him to no greater extent than is absolutely unavoidable, of that maternal care which nothing, in his estimation, can replace; the English believe that the best thing they can do for their children is to procure admission for them, at the earliest opportunity, into Eton, Winchester, Harrow, and similar foundations.

Here, again, we have a feature peculiarly characteristic of the Englishman, and his mental and moral training. Of the tender affection and ideal bent, thereby communicated to the character, which are so distinctive of the German, they apparently know and desiderate but little, and, therefore, they do not hesitate to intrust the guardianship of their children to strangers, provided only they have reason to believe them possessed of such qualifications as are necessary to make them "gentlemen." Within the school, also, a hearty and affectionate devotion of the pupil to his tutor is just as seldom met with, as an enthusiastic zeal for one or more subjects of instruction. These are by no means cherished aims, which are rather those of developing strength of purpose and judgment, and moulding the youth into an able, energetic, and self-relying man. Herein we are almost involuntarily reminded of the old Roman "virtus," and may call the attention of our readers to a letter of the late celebrated Sir Thomas Fowell Buxton, which is cited by Mr. Wiese, as strikingly illustrative of English educational principles, and which would not have been unworthy of a Cato. He thus writes to his son at school: "Let your first object be to prove to the world that you are not made of wood or straw, but that some iron is embedded in your nature. Let men know that you will do what you say—that you possess fixed, unwavering resolution—and that when you have once made up your mind, neither threats nor caresses will have any influence over you." Such is the goal to which English pædagogy naturally leads, being aided most importantly in its efforts to attain it by the boarding-houses in which the boys are placed, and where all have to submit to precisely the same treatment, even if regarded in their several homes as already great gentlemen. The realization of this object is believed to depend mainly upon the proper management and guidance of the feeling of self-respect. Grown-up men and women evince a delicate appreciation of the just rights and privileges of the boy, and it results from this that the scholar never exhibits an intimidated or cringing demeanour toward his superiors;

while his teachers, on their part, are careful not to beat him down by any undue exercise of authority, or needless severity of discipline. A conviction is generally entertained that, if a tutor once causes his pupil to fear him, he incurs imminent risk of being tricked or deceived. Even the external appearance of the masters in their official costume, which is fixed by ancient usage, is dignified without being pedantic, and well calculated to impress the minds of their haughty and turbulent charge with becoming respect. In Germany the same impression will, it is hoped, be produced by the teacher's celebrity in philology or science, which in England is expected as the result of his manly and consistent deportment, more importance being attached to what may be gained through his example, than to anything which can be acquired from his teaching. That the development of a proper degree of self-respect may not be injudiciously checked, an amount of freedom is conceded to the pupils, which in Germany would be pronounced extraordinarily great. At meal-times, and during the hours of sleep and recreation, they are subjected to scarcely any surveillance. They are permitted to write or carve their names upon the benches, or wheresoever they may please, and may read any books they may fancy. On public days, when recitations are delivered, or prizes distributed, they are allowed to applaud or hiss as freely as they please. In some schools punishments are awarded by a jury of pupils, and in certain others a weekly newspaper is published by the upper classes. Dr. Arnold, when head-master of Rugby, availed himself of the coöperation of the sixth form in editing a weekly journal. In all this, a free and liberal supervision is carefully preserved, which, in overlooking what is petty and near, does not lose sight of the resultant whole. In non-essentials, extreme latitude is given, while in matters of graver moment the utmost strictness is exercised. To the latter class, the conscientious and punctilious fulfilment of duty, in regard to the preparation of all prescribed lessons and strict observance of the truth, upon all occasions, is considered preëminently to belong.

Lying, as Mr. Wiese had opportunities of assuring himself from many and various quarters, is of very rare occurrence in the public schools of England. From this vice the boys are preserved by that feeling of self-respect, which in their case is partly innate and partly the result of training. They deem it beneath their dignity to lie; and when detected in a fault, consider it despicable cowardice to shrink from bearing the penalty. Among the Germans it is confessedly quite otherwise. In their schools, owing more particularly to a certain *esprit-du-corps*, which is diffused through every class, the point of honour is made to consist in not confessing or becoming

responsible for any offence that may have been committed, especially in the presence of one's fellow-pupils. In the larger private boarding-schools, lying is preëminently the order of the day, and the masters feel compelled, in certain cases, to connive at this vice, or even, perhaps, to extend to it a sort of tacit sanction. It would seem that the proper method of eradicating this veritable plague-spot is far from being generally adopted. Confidence awakens confidence; this is a trite, yet frequently neglected truth. There is too great a disposition to presuppose falsehood, even in cases where no real ground exists for such a supposition, and to let the scholar perceive and feel it. In this way the love of truth is easily blunted. A sounder and wiser policy seems to be that of trusting too much rather than too little, and to express this confidence frankly to the pupil, and with an emphasis that will insure his belief. By adopting such a course it may certainly be expected that the master, provided he possesses in other respects the esteem of his pupils, will be enabled, by stating to a boy who still retains some feeling for what is honourable and good, that he will accord implicit belief to his word, to induce him more readily to avow the truth, than when he suffers him to perceive that any statement he may make will be received at the very outset with disbelief or suspicion. This is undoubtedly a matter of very grave importance, and Mr. Wiese is probably correct in referring that want of courage and decision in testifying boldly for what is felt to be the truth, which many German writers have remarked, more especially of late, in the public life of their fellow-citizens, to the proneness to falsehood which so often blemishes their children. In England, a lie is punished by caning, which at Eton is inflicted even upon boys of the sixth form, when convicted of this crime. Dr. Arnold employed the cane only as a punishment for falsehood, while at Eton and other schools it is used for any gross infringement of the rules, and even for neglected lessons. This mode of punishment Mr. Wiese found to his surprise to be looked upon as inflicting no personal degradation upon the sufferer. It is regarded as the inevitable consequence of breaking rules, and as involving no diminution of the personal esteem in which a boy may be held. It is administered with severity indeed, but with a total absence of passion, by the head-master himself, in full official costume. Giver and receiver remain excellent friends, although neither of them ever forgets the occurrence—a circumstance to which it owes the largest part of its efficacy. That punishment, and even severe personal chastisement, are voluntarily submitted to, is a phenomenon to be explained by the remarkable sound sense and high veneration inherent in the Englishman's very flesh and blood for

law and for authority. On the other hand, if the proposition were submitted to a German tutor, that one of the senior boys should be solemnly visited with a flogging by the cane or birch, for a lie, or for neglect of duty, nothing could exceed his astonishment. So too with the boy himself. If he possessed any sense of personal honour, he would feel himself, in having undergone such a punishment, morally annihilated, and the idea of finding consolation in the satisfaction thereby rendered to the law would be to him absolutely incomprehensible. In his view, the law is little more than an abstraction, or, at all events, does not occupy so high a place in his esteem as his own individuality, his own subjective self-consciousness. In this one particular, it may be said that the praxis of the English rises into ideality. The idea of the State pervades their whole being from infancy upward, and makes them a great nation; while the Germans, notwithstanding all their ideality in other matters, persist in adhering to their individual prerogatives and egoism, and as a nation come to nothing. To develop and establish respect for authority, is regarded by the people of England as one main duty of the public schools; and upon the fact of their fully accomplishing this object depends essentially the favour in which, notwithstanding manifold and avowed deficiencies, they stand with the British public. It is believed that independence of mind can only be gained by first submitting to discipline at the hands of an experienced and cultivated instructor; in other words, by learning the important habit of obedience. He who understands best, albeit possessed of but little scientific attainment or reputation, how to evoke, by a scrupulously correct deportment and a dignified treatment of persons and things, the right kind of obedience, is regarded as the most accomplished and able instructor to whom their children can be confided. This requirement of obedience is not, however, as previously remarked, pushed to any greater extent than is absolutely necessary and indispensable to the true interest of all. Much, with which it is thought most expedient not to intermeddle, is overlooked, and a virtue made, perhaps, of necessity. Thus, for example, the objectionable habit of carving names in all imaginable places is turned to good account. On walls and benches, the names of great men—Dryden, Porson, Byron, Peel, Wellington—who were educated in the same schoolroom, are pointed out as a stimulus to the acquisition of like celebrity; and in this way the memorial graven in the lime and wood becomes elevated into a pious reverence for the institution, which is cherished through life to a far greater extent in England than in any other country of which we are aware, and is well portrayed in Cowper's lines:—

> "We love the play-place of our early days;
> The scene is touching, and the heart is stone
> That feels not at that sight, and feels at none.
> The wall on which we tried our graving skill,
> The very name we carved subsisting still;
> The bench on which we sat while deep employ'd,
> Though mangled, hack'd, and hew'd, not yet destroy'd."

In general terms, it may be said that the English teacher does not scruple or disdain to employ moral motives, which the more philosophic German would pronounce equivocal in character, or too external and low, provided they contain a something that induces in the will a decided movement to what is good, and assists him in leading it to this goal. The distribution of medals, prizes, and certificates of honour, which, with the names of the scholars to whom they are awarded, are published in the public journals, is a practice which, according to German ideas, is pushed to an extravagant excess. The German pedagogue desires nobler incentives to diligence and good conduct, and wishes prizes to be regarded rather as wages for some service performed, than as a stimulus to what ought to be done; and in point of fact it rarely happens that the young Teuton will exert himself simply to obtain a book. They are anxious that their scholars should seek to exhibit diligence and good conduct from the conviction that the effort to do so is alike honourable to the boy and the man; they are anxious that the upper classes should be interested in the subjects brought before their attention for their own sake, and in the majority of cases it may perhaps be affirmed that this expectation is not disappointed.

If, then, the statement of Mr. Wiese, that in a moral point of view English boys are superior to German, must be admitted, inasmuch as the former, although often frivolous, arrogant and rude, evince, generally speaking, a more docile and truthful disposition; this assertion must, nevertheless, be received with such limitations as are due to the more external and practical character of English morality, derived, as it undoubtedly is, not so much from the depth of the affections and an intelligent appreciation of moral excellence and high aspirations, as from a dutiful recognition of a line of conduct they are bound to pursue, because it is reasonable and advantageous. Measured, therefore, by a higher standard, the moral condition of English schools does not after all deserve to be rated higher than that which prevails in those of their neighbours. The same remark appears in no less degree applicable to the religious training of the English youth and the English nation in general. They are more addicted to the use of outward religious forms, and more generally in the habit of singing, praying, and reading the Bible than,

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

perhaps, any other people. Nevertheless, all has the appearance of being done in deference to the established usages of society, and of possessing no other or higher value whatever. They are customs the boy brings with him from his home, indisputably valuable, and in many instances productive of great good, but whose intrinsic worth is much abated by the consideration that they are simply external observances, which are performed like any other matter of business or routine, in conformity with a stereotype formalism, and are for this reason, in a large proportion of cases, wholly destitute of any truly ennobling and sanctifying power. This fact does not escape their own observation, but they cling tenaciously to their customs, because they assist in habituating the people, and more especially the rising generation, to a proper sense of subordination to the "higher powers," and to a fixed and definite position in society. And to this goal the entire organization of private and social life in England appears to be directed. They are throughout a political people, and in everything look rather to the end, than to the intrinsic nature of the means by which it is to be secured. With this marked feature in their policy their whole training is in harmony, and herein consists its great distinction from the German mode of education. English boys take with them to the school, habits inured at home to that moral discipline—the germ, so to speak, of their future political and religious mode of thinking—which has been handed down from one generation to another; and, in addition to this, the consciousness of belonging to a free and mighty nation. On these foundations the school continues to build, endeavouring by a less sharply defined, and consequently more efficient instrumentality, to invigorate the intellect and strengthen the character.

The German schoolboy, on the contrary, brings no such marked and deeply impressed mental habitudes from the parental roof, it being expected there that the gymnasium or the school will inspire him with loyal, patriotic, and even religious feeling. Instruction in religion, the history and national literature of his country, will, it is apprehended, accomplish this result. In a great degree, this expectation is based upon a delusion, and that wherein the German system is peculiarly defective may be learned from the English method of instruction and training. To be strong and powerful as a nation, the former greatly need that faculty of self-restraint which is so characteristic of the latter, and which Rome in the times of the republic, Sparta, and even Athens, before Socrates and the Sophists had undermined the ancient faith and moral habits of their fellow-citizens, possessed in a like remarkable degree. It has been truly observed of the Germans, that they

suffer greatly from the very excess of thought and emotion. Herein consist their greatness and their weakness. Their mental versatility prevents them from attaining a fixed political form and character, and causes them to be numbered in the category of "foiled potentialities." An Alexander might, perhaps, with their assistance conquer the world; but after his decease they would scarcely escape the wretchedness of submission to the sway of a succession of tyrants. Ere the great day arrives in which their nationality will be recognised, either different principles from those which now govern the world must become current, or they themselves must undergo a change. Their habit of expatiation—of dealing with the vague, the unknown, and the universal—must circumscribe its sweep, and their aims and aspirations must be more narrowly defined. In this change, the school, with which we are now exclusively concerned, must participate, although without abandoning, on this account, its proper character and functions.

We are far from believing that, in the details, English schools can be employed advantageously as a model; on the contrary, it is evident that they will be compelled to adopt such modifications and relaxations in their discipline, as will bring them into closer approximation to German institutions. Already the number of those who are embarked in the cause of school and university reform in England is very great. At Rugby, years ago, Dr. Arnold was induced to institute many innovations, although, it must be confessed, the success of the experiment fell so far short of his anticipations, that he found himself compelled, for example, to restore the clumsy system of manufacturing Greek and Latin verses, which he had cut down considerably, to the same extent as previously, and in other respects also was led to abandon, toward the close of his career, many improvements which he had ventured to introduce. The impending reform of the universities will, in any event, have for its consequence a partial revolution of the schools. But to such a medley of studies as prevails at present in the German gymnasia, it will certainly not be driven.

Art. III.—NIEBUHR.

The Life and Letters of Barthold George Niebuhr, with Essays on his Character and Influence. By the Chevalier Bunsen, and Professors Brandis and Loebell. New-York: Harper & Brothers. 1852. 1 vol., 12mo.

In an age of insincerity and pretension, like the present, we cannot conceive of any secular reading more invigorating than the modest life and manly letters of Niebuhr. The external and the internal life of a great man must always excite a very vivid interest; the accurate and conscientious biography of a truly good one must ever be refreshing, except to the few who have entirely paralyzed, by long perseverance in vicious habitudes, that capacity for the sympathetic admiration of virtue which is the common heritage of youth; but when goodness and greatness are both united in the same individual, we may expect redoubled pleasure from the rarity of the combination, and from the light which each illumined part of the brilliant character reflects upon the other. Such an expectation is most felicitously gratified by this Life of Niebuhr, which assumes in a great measure the form and truthfulness of an unconscious autobiography. The outlines of the portrait, and the surrounding incidents which serve as a back-ground and explain its historical relations, are simply and vigorously sketched in the brief narrative which connects together the several epistolary groups; but the life, the action, the intellectual and moral constitution of the man, whose representation completes the picture, are furnished by the ample series of Niebuhr's own letters. To aid the judgment of others, and quicken their apprehension of the illustrious dead, we are favoured, in a sort of appendix, with the impressions produced by Niebuhr's daily contact and association upon some of the distinguished men who were honoured with his friendship and familiarity. Thus Niebuhr, the man, is exhibited to us under the most important aspects: not as a special, fixed, and inanimate phenomenon, changing by methodical gradations through a uniform succession of monotonous developments. which is too often the case in biographies; but with all his complex yet homogeneous variations, and with the quick alternations of feeling and fancy, which characterize the spontaneous manifestations of real life, and present the same features under such diverse angles and in such dissimilar lights to different observers. Those intermingling colours and shifting phases which run into each other with an easy and natural flow, and produce the diversities, the conflicting interpretations, and the apparent anoma-

lies of the same life, are all preserved by the mode of delineation adopted in this volume; while ordinarily all these characteristic discrepancies are obliterated beneath the single colour which is spread over the whole canvass. The result is, that we find in the present instance an indescribable charm in the biography, which heightens all the excellences of the picture, and adds to the other strong attractions possessed by the simple story of a good and great man's career.

Niebuhr's birth placed him in that intermediate grade of society which is equally removed from the vanities, frivolities, and temptations of wealth, and from the daily exactions and stern necessities of poverty; a class which possesses all the hopes and few of the clogs of life; which can offer to its sons every incitement to effort, and, at the same time, provide them with the preliminary assistance to render effort effectual, without ministering to indolence or self-indulgence. The father of Niebuhr enjoyed a moderate independence, and held under the Danish crown the office of Secretary to the province of South-Ditmarsh. To Meldorf, the chief town of the district, he retired in 1778, with his little family, consisting of his wife and two children—a daughter of four years of age, and his son Barthold, who was about two years old at the time, having been born on the 27th August, 1776—but a few weeks after the declaration of the independence of the United States, and thus at the commencement of that great series of political changes which have transformed the history of the world, and have not yet reached their full accomplishment.

In this retreat Carsten Niebuhr continued to reside for thirty-seven years, till his death in 1815. Remote from the attractions, as from the facilities of the great world—for railroads had not then penetrated into Holstein—he spent the remainder of his simple and honest existence in the conscientious discharge of the duties of his office, in the education of his children, and in the practice of the kindly charities of a benevolent life. A limited circle of intelligent friends gave animation to the tranquillity of his seclusion; an occasional visit from scientific strangers broke the calm routine, brightened his reminiscences, and preserved his connection with the intellectual world, which continued to honour his name. Forgetting that world, though not of that world forgot, he pursued noiselessly the even tenor of his way, and rendered a greater service to humanity by the education which he imparted to his illustrious son, in this unpromising obscurity, than he could have accomplished by prosecuting his contemplated journey into the heart of Africa, or by the eager pursuit of honours and distinctions. This contentment of an

adventurous and renowned traveller with the common-place routine of an humble life, affords such a contrast to the love of display, the desire of excitement, and the craving for notoriety, which so frequently accompany intellectual eminence, that we regard it with admiration and delight. It is gratifying to witness the unsophisticated nature of man escaping without regret from the gilded harness which enchants, while it fetters, minds of a less healthy and vigorous tone.

The father employed his young son, as his years increased, in his own occupations, pleasures, and studies, and soon commenced devoting himself diligently to his education. He seemed to look forward to the accomplishment, by his offspring, of the more ambitious hopes which had haunted his own youthful dreams, but had been resigned for the cares of settled life. The father entered as cordially into the amusements as into the studies of his children; and he often contrived to render even their recreations instructive. He made collections of coins and seals for them, from which they took casts, and thus studied heraldry, and, we should suppose, something of numismatics also: both important aids to the acquisition of certain portions of history. In summer he assisted his boy in building fortifications in the garden according to military science, and taught him to attack and defend them by rule. The child was to make his acquaintance with actual war in a less agreeable and scientific form, as a full private in the landwehr when the disastrous invasion of Prussia by Napoleon took place. But the lessons so pleasantly studied in Holstein produced their fruit in the sagacious criticisms on Livy's descriptions of battles, which constitute so important a feature in his Roman History.

But the attention of the father was not confined to the sports of his children: he taught them English, French, Mathematics and Geography; he related to them stories from history, perhaps similar to the heroic legends composed by the historian for his son, and probably wonderful tales and curious incidents of travel, picked up by himself in his extensive wanderings through the marvellous East —for Arabia, and the whole land of the morning, as the Germans poetically call Asia, were then unknown regions; they had not yet been revealed to Europe by the invasion of Napoleon, they were not reached by peninsular and oriental steamers, tapped by railroads, or traversed by touring penny-a-liners as they are now. They were still the lands of the sun and of enchantment, and were calculated to stimulate the imagination of the listener as much as his mind was instructed by the personal observation of the teacher. The elder Niebuhr appears to have taught his son also something

of the Latin and the Greek, and to have afforded him occasional glimpses into astronomy and the other physical sciences; but for these sciences, though he studied them afterward in the regular course of his university education, and mastered their principles and leading outlines, he seems never to have had much affection.

This alternation of instructive amusement and agreeable study, with his father as the companion and superintendent of both, must have been of essential service to the young Niebuhr, especially as it was commenced at a very early age. His aptitude for learning was very remarkable; he was quick in acquiring, and tenacious in remembering; and, at the same time, eager and restless for the attainment of multifarious knowledge. His father speaks of him at six years old with parental fondness and apprehension. He is alarmed at the warmth and impetuosity of his temper, which was not exactly passionate, but impatient, sensitive, and irritable. This rapid fever of the blood, though cooled down by advancing years and a steady effort of self-restraint, was throughout life a constant source of mortification and self-reproach to the historian, and occasioned at times a harshness of manner, and asperity of expression, which were wholly at variance with the exuberant benevolence of his heart. In the praises and alarms of his father, who expatiates in correspondence with his friends on the subject of his most anxious affections—the promise of his boy—we readily distinguish the rudimentary germs of the future character of the more illustrious son. As a child, he was brave, candid, upright, and sincere; proud, yet modest and shy—the moral paradox of all true genius; imaginative, with the extreme sensitiveness which always accompanies any high development of that faculty; tender, affectionate, impressible, and consequently irritable; studious, and persevering, though always deeming himself indolent for intermitting his labours while anything remained to be accomplished. While he was yet a youth, we find all these tendencies blending themselves into one homogeneous nature, and giving to his intellect that tone and temper which adapted it so admirably for its career of original historical investigation. These varied powers, mental and moral, converged toward a point, and, fusing the abundant and dissimilar materials gained from his father's conversation, from his own assiduous studies and promiscuous reading, and from the wide circle of accidental sources, assumed the appearance of a faculty of prophetic insight into the changes and destinies of nations. We are told that when the Turkish war broke out in 1787, it so strongly excited his mind that he dreamed of it at night, and fancied himself reading from the newspapers the intelligence of events which had not yet occurred, but which

were realized shortly afterward. His accurate divination of the military transactions, the shifting currents of the popular commotions in the French Revolution, and the plans and objects of the revolutionary leaders, is said to have excited the astonishment of Count Bernstorff. Such statements are regarded or disregarded as wild prodigies by those who comprehend neither the capabilities of a vigorous and comprehensive mind, nor the application of the multifarious materials of political knowledge; but when accurate and varied information of sufficient extent is at the service of an intellect capable of appreciating and employing it, and fired with the anticipative ardour of the imagination which divines the future and reconstructs the past out of the elements which compose them, we meet with those rare but genuine instances of prophecy which are the fruit of the union of genius with science. Such a gift, duly restrained in its exercise by a sober judgment, is the compass of the great statesman, and the conjuring rod of the great historian; and we may attribute Niebuhr's distinguished success in both capacities, but especially in the latter, to the eminent degree in which he possessed this remarkable faculty.* For the process of reviving the past from the scattered relics and mutilated memorials which have been handed down to us, is strictly analogous to that of anticipating the future from its connection with the past, and its partial manifestation in the present. Thus the singularly original and novel character of Niebuhr's historical labours may be regarded as the consequence of a peculiar individual endowment, and the triumph of a particular cast of intellect, formed and educated under favourable circumstances, rather than as the result of one of those discoveries which force themselves into the light after the lapse of

---

* Procopius, a truly great historian, remarks, *τοῖς ἀεὶ προγεγενημένοις τεκμηριοῦσθαι τὰ ἐσόμενα ξὺν τῷ ἀσφαλεῖ δύνανται ἄνθρωποι.* De Bello Gothico, lib. iii, c. xxxiv, vol. ii, p. 420, ed. Bonn. Old Jerome Wolf, one of the long-buried giants, says: "Præscientia rerum futurarum, si qua est, divini potius esse muneris quam humani creditur; etsi non desunt qui vel natura incitati, vel usu rerum "edocti ea prædicunt, quæ multo post futura sunt.'" Præf. ad Zonaram, p. xxx. Coleridge (Biog. Lit., c. x,) explains Burke's brilliancy as a statesman, as we have explained Niebuhr's success.

The same idea is beautifully expressed by Shakspeare, King Henry IV, part ii, act iii, sc. 1:—

"Warwick—There is a history in all men's lives,
Figuring the nature of the times deceased:
The which observed, a man may prophesy
With a near aim of the main chance of things
As yet not come to life; which in their seeds,
And weak beginnings, lie intreasured.
Such things become the hatch and brood of time."

time, and are revealed to the ostensible discoverers by the accidents of science, or the spontaneous advancement of knowledge. Niebuhr's mode of treating an historical subject was almost entirely new; it was not merely an extension and improvement of former practices, but the introduction of a new and more scientific one; and the novel method was suggested less by the existing state of historical literature than by the peculiarities of Niebuhr's own moral and intellectual constitution. We have partially traced the circumstances under which that constitution was developed, and to its further study we now return.

Niebuhr seems to have derived much benefit in his childhood from the instruction and the library of a literary neighbour in Meldorf. This was Boje, editor of the Deutsches Museum, who had been appointed prefect of the province in 1781, and who took great interest in the promise and proficiency of the young genius. From Madam Boje Niebuhr received assistance in his French studies, which had been commenced under his father; but these pleasant and profitable lessons were terminated, in his tenth year, by the death of his kind teacher. Before this time, however, he had manifested his literary tendencies by numerous essays on political and other subjects, and had even displayed some aptitude for poetical composition. His classical studies were prosecuted at home under the superintendence of his father, with the aid of an incompetent teacher from the gymnasium of the town. It was not till his thirteenth year that he attended the gymnasium itself. Up to this period he had pursued a desultory but extensive course of study at home; and even before the completion of his eighth year he had mastered the English language sufficiently to read without help any work in that tongue. He had also had the advantage of an association, which was something more than the mere familiarity of a child, with Voss, the translator of Homer, whom accident, family connections, or other causes, had attracted to Meldorf. Niebuhr's stay at the local academy was of brief duration. He was the youngest, but the most advanced member of the upper class; and, in the year after his entrance, on the departure of most of his elder classmates, he was once more relegated to home study, but superintended this time by the principal of the gymnasium, who gave him an hour's private lesson every day. In this manner, which might have been fatal to a less diligent and inquiring mind, his education was conducted until he went to the University of Kiel, in 1794. His course was interrupted by one brief interlude, when his father sent him to Hamburg, to a school founded and conducted by an old friend of his of the name of Büsch, which was then the most celebrated in Europe for instruc-

tion in the modern languages and commercial science. The whirl of excitement and dissipation, into which he was thrown, rendered study hopeless; and he soon implored his father to restore him to his home, a prayer which was granted after three months' absence. At Büsch's house Niebuhr acquired the acquaintance of Lessing, Reimarus, and other notabilities, and the friendship of Klopstock and Ebeling; but in the midst of the brilliant society which was congregated there, he felt that his youth and his objects were alike incompatible with the tastes prevailing around him. His return home was accordingly both beneficial and acceptable.

Before his departure for the university we find him engaged in the erudite occupation of collating MSS. which were supplied by Münter from Copenhagen, and by Heyne from Göttingen. Heyne was anxious that the supervision of Niebuhr's education should be confided to him; and this was apparently the desire of his father, though his views on the subject were frustrated by the condition of European affairs consequent upon the breaking out of the first French Revolution; for it was during the confusion of this stormy period that Niebuhr's youth was spent. Indeed, the grief inspired by the terrible incidents of that gloomy time suggested to the future historian of Rome emigration to the shores of America; but his imaginations with regard to the internal aspect of the United States must have been very different at that age from the convictions on the subject which he cherished in his later life. The impressions left on his mind by the events of this period were singularly deep and permanent, and determined in a great measure his political creed and philosophy; they coloured all his kindred speculations, infused themselves into his historical views, regulated his interpretation of the vast changes in European society and in the European system, which he witnessed in his mature years, and spread a hue of melancholy over all his anticipations of the future. In all of Niebuhr's writings, but especially in his letters, we read the ruling secret of his thoughts, which had been inspired and confirmed by the French Revolution and its developments. He might have appropriately adopted the short but significant device:—

> Le passé me tourmente, et je crains l'avenir.

Niebuhr's stay at the University of Kiel was limited to two years, and was terminated by the acceptance of the office of private secretary to Count Schimmelman, the Danish minister of finance. There is little that is striking in his collegiate career; he seems to have studied exclusively those branches of learning which had not entered into the circle of his home education. The Roman Law, Meta-

physics, and the other branches of Ethics, and the Natural Sciences occupied his scholastic hours. For Metaphysics he manifested little aptitude: but he appreciated the depth and sagacity of Kant; he perceived the importance of a philosophical substratum for history, but he recognised at the same time the dangers which might spring, and have since sprung, from the theories of the Transcendental school. We find Niebuhr's admiration for the classics, and especially for Aristotle and Cicero, already confirmed; and we notice with interest his early assurance that history was his true vocation. Having been urged by Dr. Hensler, an old friend of his father's, and a valuable friend to himself, to devote himself to the study of the natural history of antiquity, he remarks on the proposal: "This is a good, and worthy, and beautiful pursuit for those who like it; but from the peculiar direction of my mind and talents, I believe that nature has intended me for a literary man, an historian of ancient and modern times, a statesman, and perhaps a man of the world: although the last, thank God, neither in the proper sense of the word, nor in the horrible one which is usually associated with it. Meanwhile my individual taste will certainly carry the day; and if my name is ever to be spoken of, I shall be known as an historian and political writer, as an antiquarian and philologist."* He had truly anticipated his future career; and his intellectual tastes proved to be prophetic instincts. It will be noticed that he was ambitious of distinction; this desire of fame, "the last infirmity of noble minds," is the earliest stimulant of genius, the last weakness over which it triumphs.† In Niebuhr it was no vulgar love of notoriety, but the desire of excellence, and the assurance of that excellence which the testimony of fame bestows. "I will receive roses and myrtles from female hands," says he, "but no laurels; I only wish that I may plant them and then be crowned by three or five men."‡ "Knowledge, what is commonly called learning, mere dull memory-work, will never be the aim of my exertions. The one thing needful is, to cultivate one's understanding for one's self, so as to render it capable of production. He who merely crams himself with the conceptions of other men's minds, clothed in forms foreign to his own nature, will never accomplish much. Quiet and independent energetic industry can alone attain to what is true, and bring forth what is really useful."§

---

* Letter xi. 16. November, 1794. Niebuhr's Life, &c., p. 55.

† It is remarkable that Milton's numerous commentators have not remembered the observation of Tacitus relative to Helvidius Priscus. "Erant quibus adpetentior famæ videretur, quando etiam sapientibus cupido gloriæ novissima exuitur." Tac. Hist., lib. iv, c. 5.

‡ Letter ix. 7. September, 1794, p. 54.

§ Letter x, p. 55.

These are remarkable sentiments to be entertained by a young man of eighteen, and are expressed with an accuracy and precision equally remarkable. It is, however, still more important to observe that his whole life was guided by these principles, and was a practical commentary on these early aspirations. He attained almost more than he had proposed to himself.

A few months after his arrival at Kiel, he writes: "My head swims when I survey what I have yet to learn—philosophy, mathematics, physics, chemistry, natural history. Then, too, I must perfect myself in history, German and French, and study Roman law, and the political constitutions of Europe, as far as I can, and increase my knowledge of antiquities."* If he did not learn all this, within the period of five years as proposed by himself, he learned more than this in the ensuing years, for his father enumerates, in 1807, twenty languages with which his son was at that time acquainted.

Whoever has studied the notes to Niebuhr's History of Rome, and observed the numberless mutilated and scattered fragments which are brought together in the wonderful mosaic of the text, or has noticed the easy familiarity with the Consular Fasti, and the wilderness of recurring names which is displayed in the course of the history, must have been amazed at the fidelity and minute retention of Niebuhr's memory, and must recognise how essential such a memory was for the accomplishment of the peculiar triumph which Niebuhr achieved. He was entirely mistaken, however, in supposing that his vigorous memory impaired his judgment; it facilitated and strengthened it, and multiplied the instances embraced by its inductions. His judgment was equally profound and sober, and possessed a range and fidelity which gave to his conclusions, very frequently, the semblance of inspiration; and his subsequent estimation of his merits was more just than his previous suspicion of the dangers to be apprehended from his memory. "If I have anything to thank nature for," he writes to Madame Hensler, "her best gift to me was a correct and very rapid judgment, a facility in detecting everything false, incorrect, untrue, that can hardly be imposed upon."† Its merits, however, extended even further than this. It was combined and often identified with that highest order of imagination, which divines causes from their effects, and effects from their causes; which discerns what is wanting from the fragments that are known; and by the application of general laws to each partial manifestation, is enabled to dispense with the aid of a complete revelation. It was by the high development and sagacious exercise of this very rare faculty that Niebuhr was enabled to reconstruct the early periods

* Letter v, p. 51.

† Letter xxvi, p. 79.

of Roman history from the mutilated and misunderstood legends which were preserved by Livy and Dionysius Halicarnassensis, and from the disconnected fragments which had been embalmed in the rude conglomerate of Servius and other miscellaneous writers of late times. He undoubtedly estimated himself justly, when he remarked that "the chief talent I possess, or have preserved, besides that of memory, (and indeed, it is the cause of the latter,) is a very quick comprehension of the matter in hand, a correct and clear perception, which almost invariably seizes at once on the true state of the case."*

This instinctive discernment of the truth in the midst of all the complications of error with which the truth might be entwined was conspicuously illustrated in his mode of treating the tangled questions of early history; but it also enabled him to act with promptness, discretion, and success in the business affairs of life. He was frequently employed, and always with credit, in the solution of financial problems, and the transaction of financial and other arduous business. He became a Jew among the Jews, a Gentile among the Gentiles; mixed with bankers, and brokers, and money-changers, and amazed them all with his superior expertness and perspicuity in the tortuous labyrinths of their own obscure policy.† We find him at one time looking to mercantile occupations as the sole probable means‡ of support and independence; at another offered a lucrative partnership singly for the sake of his talents in speculation.§ Yet he was conscious of the dangers and temptations which surrounded such pursuits; he avoided them as far as was practicable, consistent with urgent duties, and he escaped with pleasure and exhilaration from the contamination of intrigues, political, mercantile, or financial.||

In his early life Niebuhr was inclined to scepticism, notwithstanding the constant presence of a decidedly religious temperament; but his moral sense was remarkably acute and sensitive. He felt intuitively the contagion of the daily life of the world around him, and his sentiments revolted at practices which his intellect soon comprehended, and was obliged sometimes to employ. It is one of the most painful disasters of the current age, that the necessities of life and the irresistible coercion of the common procedure of our contemporaries, bear down with them in the common torrent of the times even those who recognise the fatal tendencies, the immoral character, and the defilement of the prevalent course of worldly

---

* Letter xxxiii, p. 85.

† Letter lxxxi, p. 143.

‡ "I can earn a living either as a scholar or a merchant." Letter lxxxiv, p. 148.

§ Niebuhr's Life, p. 156.

|| Letter cxxiii, p. 206.

action. In vain they struggle against the stream, in vain they yield to the inspirations of purer sentiments, and endeavour to extricate themselves from the rushing cataract; they are either overwhelmed by the boiling waters, or they are thrown exhausted, gasping, unheeded, on the dry and barren strand. In Niebuhr's day, and especially in Germany, the reckless avidity for gain had not yet acquired such a lamentable ascendency as it has since obtained; but it was already sufficiently displayed to excite his apprehensions and disgust; and he endeavoured through life, with a singular degree of success, to follow the dictates of a healthy conscience, and to free himself from the chains of a selfish and greedy generation.

Niebuhr's stay at Kiel, if it has left behind no proofs of startling brilliancy, must have impressed deeply on others the conviction of talents and qualities more estimable than any display, for it subsequently led to an offer of a professorship there, which was declined, and was the stepping-stone to his future advancement. It had the further important effect of introducing him to his first bride, to whom he was betrothed in the autumn of 1787, wedded in May, 1800, and from whom he was separated by death, after a happy union, on the 21st June, 1815. She was three years older than himself, but he deemed this an advantage, considering that his dreamy tendencies, his non-observant habits, his inattention to the small details of life, and his vacillating spirits required the steadiness of a more advanced companion. In this estimate of himself he exaggerated his own defects, according to his usual habit; but perhaps did no more than justice to the high qualities and "Roman character" of his wife.*

Before leaving Kiel, Niebuhr displayed that intuitive sagacity which is at once the fruit of a just appreciation of past history, and the most essential aid to such appreciation, by declaring, that in four years from November, 1794, a monarchy would be reëstablished in France.† The prediction was wrong by a single year. In later life, and when his judgment had been more matured, he would not have pretended to determine the times and seasons, which are with God. It is hazardous and imprudent to attempt to define in advance the exact period of great political events. The events themselves may be foreseen, but their periods cannot be foreknown, because, as they are dependent upon an infinitude of complicated, trivial, and even accidental causes, there are many incognizable circumstances to expedite or retard their occurrence, although the anticipations of men are usually more impatient than the impassive march of destiny.

* Letter xviii, p. 69.

† Letter xiii, p. 56.

From the university Niebuhr passed into the employment of Count Schimmelman, where, besides the ostensible duties of his office, he was often engaged in the delicate transactions of public affairs, which he managed with skill and discernment. But the gayeties and festivities of the minister's house accorded ill with Niebuhr's tastes and purposes. His retiring disposition, as well as other motives, rendered him averse to the elegant dissipations of high life, and the countess took umbrage at his absence from her parties. But the routine of frivolities encroached so seriously on the leisure hours which Niebuhr sought to devote to the prosecution of his studies, that his situation became equally unprofitable and unpleasant to himself, and he gladly accepted from Count Bernstorff the post of supernumerary Secretary to the Royal Library, with permission ultimately to travel abroad. He had been offered by France, and had declined, an appointment which would have gratified his ardent desire to visit the Eternal City—the scene and the subject of so many future labours. In August, 1797, a month or two after the close of his actual service with Count Schimmelman, that nobleman offered him the Consul-generalship at Paris; but the urgent claims of a man of greater age, experience, and longer public service secured the post before Niebuhr had rendered his decision. He suffered no disappointment; but rejoiced in his escape.

Niebuhr may have been rendered less solicitous about the promotion presented by the consulship to Paris, by the prospect at this time held out to him of an early appointment to a professorship at Kiel. The offer was indeed made to him three years later, after his return from England, his marriage, and his refusal of a chair at Copenhagen. At this time, however, it would have been grateful to him; he was looking forward to it in hope: and in the expectation of receiving it sketched for himself the outline of a course of study which should prepare him for the suitable discharge of his duties as a lecturer on Ancient Literature and Ancient History, the subjects of his early choice and of his subsequent distinction. In this sketch we discover the course which furnished him with the vast treasury of learning and information afterward employed in the composition of his Roman History. The fidelity of research, the exuberance of erudition, the comprehensiveness of view, which characterize that unrivalled production, are distinctly contemplated and provided for in this plan of proposed study. He intends to "read through all the ancient writings still extant, at least once, with the closest attention—the more important works many times; to acquire a profound and practical acquaintance with the grammar of the two classical languages;" to attain "a systematic philosophy,

as the groundwork of all settled convictions, and all accurate thought," and an orderly "method of thinking, writing, and studying;" to exercise himself in the art of composition, and gain a thorough command of his mother tongue.* These are the preliminary tasks to be executed before he "could accept a professorship in Kiel without a blush." We are doubtful whether there are not many of our American professors who are content to pass through their career without the twentieth part of these acquisitions, or any suspicion of their necessity.

Perhaps it was in prosecution of the course of study thus marked out for himself that we find Niebuhr, in the winter of 1797–8, dipping into the Byzantine historians, a new edition of whom he counselled and initiated in the closing years of his life.

The greater part of his life was, however, destined to be spent in far other scenes and occupations than the tranquillity and seclusion of collegiate duties. He had been contemplating, during the recent months, a visit to England, with the design of studying more carefully the physical sciences, which he had always treated with indifference, which he continued to neglect, and continually repented of neglecting. He had, however, still higher aims. No person ever attended more faithfully and assiduously to the never-ending duty of self-examination, self-education, and self-amelioration; and he was desirous, by throwing himself among the practical realities of English society, to strengthen his mental and physical energies, to learn self-reliance, to study the beatings of the great heart of society, and the functions of its internal economy, and to acquire a taste for the study and observation of nature.†

In London he spent four months, and proceeded to Edinburgh to pursue his studies at the university. Here he remained about a year. Notwithstanding his constant complaints of his want of observation, which, like the complaint of his idleness, would have been without any foundation, if applied to another man, he studied critically the character of both the English and the Scotch, and did not fail to distinguish acutely between the good and bad points of their national character and institutions. He imbibed, however, and ever retained, a high admiration of the integrity, sincerity, energy, and directness of the English, and admired their system of government, without yielding to the infatuation since so fatally exemplified on the European continent, of supposing that the sole desirable progress or reform consisted in the imitation of the jury trial and the representative system of England.‡ Notwithstanding his liberal

---

* Letter xxiv, p. 77.

† Niebuhr's Life, &c., p. 80. Letter liv, p. 111; lv, p. 112.

‡ Letter cviii, p. 186.

tendencies and his ardour in the cause of well-regulated freedom, he was not seduced by the Utopian dreams but licentious plans of the Prices, Priestleys, and Horne Tookes. He detected in the germ the evils that must ensue from such principles; he saw that the proposed benefits could not be realized; and the daily growing communion between anarchy and liberalism rendered him suspicious of the professions of the liberal party, and apprehensive of their progress.*

Niebuhr's residence and studies in Great Britain were undoubtedly of great advantage to him. He saw the cities of many men, and familiarized himself with the thoughts and habits of a strange people. He had gone abroad to correct failings in his own moral constitution which could only be remedied by change of scene, change of association, and the necessity of independent action. His hopes of future eminence were high, he felt himself "capable of great things, and called upon to perform them;"† but he was aware of the obstacles to be overcome, and had resolutely occupied himself with their removal. He returned to Denmark with the assurance that "idleness and aimless occupation will henceforth be no longer possible;" with his "intellect calm and strong, with the consciousness of capacity for action and of being equal to his own requirements;" with "that sense of life, on whose intensity depends the practice of all that is right and noble."‡ He had shaken off the littleness and dreamy enthusiasm of his youth, and had become a man alive to the duties and realities of life.

A few months after his return, Niebuhr married his betrothed, Amelia Behrens, and settled at Copenhagen. He had been appointed Assessor at the Board of Trade for the East India Department, and Secretary and head clerk of the standing Commission of the affairs of Barbary. In his leisure hours he undertook to draw up an account of the various constitutions of Greece; a design which would have been exceedingly valuable if it had been accomplished by such hands, which might have diminished our regret for the loss of the Politics of Aristotle, and which had long been entertained by him. His wife's ill health, however, interrupted his studies. During the spring of next year he was present in Copenhagen during its bombardment by Lord Nelson. In the spring of 1802, the whole duties of the Board of Trade were devolved upon him by the resignation of his colleague; but he rejoiced in his employments, which won for him "a fair fame," and "the confidence even of the unlearned among his fellow-citizens." His multiplied engagements did not prevent the prosecution of his studies. He commenced at this time

* Letter xliii, p. 99.

† Letter xlvi, p. 101; lix, p. 115; c, p. 177.

‡ Letter lxix, p. 123.

those examinations into the agrarian laws and the public domain of Rome, which afterwards produced a complete revolution in the sentiments of scholars on these subjects, and enabled him in his Roman History to place the characters and conduct in a just light, after centuries of obloquy and misapprehension. These topics he afterward declared to be the most arduous portion of his great historical labours, and they were certainly among the most original; yet it was in the midst of numerous and onerous public duties that these profound investigations were undertaken. So true is the observation of Quintilian, that the time for study will never be wanting to those who economize their hours.*

In 1804 Niebuhr became first director of the Bank of Copenhagen, a position of great honour, influence, and responsibility; but he still retained his connection with the Board of Trade, and with the Commission for the affairs of Barbary. In 1806 he was induced to leave Denmark by the proposal to enter on the joint-directorship of the first Bank of Berlin and the Seehandlung, a privileged company engaged in foreign commerce. He had no other reason to be dissatisfied with his situation in Copenhagen than his apprehension that the constant attention to mere matters of detail would permanently weaken the powers of his mind. He was already engaged in investigating the early history of Rome; and had published in the preceding year a translation of the First Philippic of Demosthenes, from a conviction that the career of Napoleon was recalling the times of Philip.

Niebuhr arrived in Berlin just in time to witness the subjugation of Prussia by Napoleon, and to participate in the anxieties and sufferings of the kingdom. He was obliged to retire with his family before the advance of the French armies to Stettin, to Dantzic, to Königsberg, to Memel. The functions which he had been invited to undertake were suspended during the commotion; and, if it had not been repugnant to his feelings and principles to abandon those who were in distress, he would have accepted some of the proposals which were made to him during these emergencies by Denmark, England and Russia. Instead of doing so he received an appointment in the Commissariat; which, however, he soon became anxious to resign in consequence of the dismissal of the minister, Stein. In April, 1807, he was entrusted by Count Hardenberg with the financial business of the Commissariat. His health sunk under his fatigues, exposures and anxieties. He was attacked with typhus fever, and for some time was in great danger. The misfortunes of Prussia continued to increase; in June the government was dissolved, and what remained

---

* Quintil. Inst. Or., lib. xii, c. xi, §§ 16–19. This passage is too long for citation.

of the court retreated to Riga. Niebuhr now applied for his discharge, but was induced by pressing entreaties to retain his post. In the course of the next month peace was concluded, and Hardenberg removed from office at the instance of Napoleon. Niebuhr again sent in his resignation, which was not accepted, but refused with the highest marks of confidence by the king. During this delay he had been appointed by the king a member of the provisional committee of government, destined to supply temporarily the want of a regular ministry, by whose labours were performed those great constitutional reforms which so speedily resuscitated Prussia after all her recent calamities. In the winter of 1807 he was despatched from Memel to negotiate a loan in Holland, in order to meet the contributions exacted by the French. During the course of the ensuing summer he received credentials as Prussian minister to Holland. He was partially successful in effecting the object of his mission; and the circumstances of the times were such as to render any success almost a triumph. On his retirement from Holland in April, 1809, he spent some time with his relations in Denmark; but was recalled to official duties at Berlin. The administration of Hardenberg, in whom he had no confidence, was not satisfactory to him, and he requested a release from his ministerial duties, and in their stead a professorship in the new university about to be opened at Berlin. Hardenberg endeavoured to induce Niebuhr to withdraw his resignation, and it is said offered him the portfolio of Finance; but in vain. Niebuhr was resolute, and perhaps impracticable. He withdrew in great measure from government affairs, and received the appointment of historiographer, as the successor of the celebrated historian, Von Müller; but with the condition annexed that he should assist Count Hardenberg and his minister of finance with his counsel and advice when required.

The cares of business, as we have already seen, did not compel Niebuhr to intermit altogether either his studies or his original investigations; the turmoil of war and the honours of an embassy, however unfavourable to his pursuits, did not arrest them, or paralyze his ardour. During the changing scenes and anxieties through which he had passed since his removal to Prussia, he had been steadily engaged during his leisure hours in augmenting his literary acquisitions, or developing his views. In his letter to Baron Von Stein, written from Memel during the gloomiest period of the French invasion, he mingles with the discussion of state policy and cabinet changes, intimations of the Russian and Sclavonic studies in which he had been engaged.* While ambassador in Holland he composed

---

* Letter xcv, p. 163.

those treatises which have been published in his posthumous miscellanies.* He was never idle: he was ever eagerly reaching after new branches of learning, or extending his acquaintance with those which he had already mastered.

The University of Berlin was opened in the autumn of 1810. The principal chairs were occupied by the most distinguished scholars of Germany. Of these, (besides Niebuhr,) Savigny, Schleiermacher, Buttmann and Heindorff have obtained universal reputation. Spalding is less known, but was scarcely less highly endowed in the estimation of his colleagues. The academical labours of Niebuhr were commenced by a series of lectures on Roman history, delivered gratuitously. They were original and learned beyond all anticipation, and successful beyond all hope. Instead of the class of college boys for whom they had been designed, they were attended by the most brilliant and intelligent audiences. The students were, indeed, present in large numbers, but by their side sat the members of the academy of Berlin, the professors of the university, dignitaries of state, men of high and established reputations, and public officers of all grades. Savigny, Schleiermacher, Spalding, Ancillon, Nicolavius, and Süven, sat upon the crowded benches, amazed, admiring and approving. Such an audience, and such auditors, reacted upon the impressible and sympathetic nature of the lecturer, and he proceeded with new animation to develop his novel views of the long misunderstood progress of a great people, and to gain new successes and additional renown. He had undertaken the exposition of a subject apparently threadbare; he pulled to pieces the old web, examined every thread in the warp and the woof, wove it again into new patterns, and presented to his hearers a narrative apparently new, from the happy disposition of the old materials, and the still happier employment of such as had been used before. But Niebuhr's development of Roman history was not only new, it was essentially true; and it was a sudden revelation, after long centuries of error, from which even the Romans themselves and their historians had not been free. Glareanus, Perizonius, Vico, and Beaufort had all expressed some degree of scepticism relative to the correctness of the representations of Roman history given by Livy and Dionysius of Halicarnassus: but they had done little more than to utter doubts, which had been feebly supported, and had passed into almost entire neglect. When Niebuhr commenced his lectures it might still be said of the history of Rome, as Lucan had said with a different meaning prophetically,

---

* Niebuhr's Life, p. 168.

> "Huic omne Latinum
> Fabula nomen erat."[*]

But Niebuhr afforded full and ample reasons for scepticism; he adduced from the long array of the neglected authors of Latin literature, and from a more critical examination of the better known writers, evidences of error; and while pointing out the fallacies, he proceeded to reconstruct the truth in a manner which accorded better with the authorities, and harmonized with the laws and the experience of human progress. Savigny was distinctly in the right in declaring, after the delivery of the first lecture, that Niebuhr was opening a new era for Roman history. The result has shown that it was more; that it was a new era for all history.

The first draft of Niebuhr's lectures was undoubtedly very different from the work as completed; and, if we may judge from those lectures which have been latterly published from the notes of his hearers, far inferior to it in depth, comprehension, accuracy and learning. Still as the series at Berlin was delivered from written notes, while at Bonn he trusted entirely to his memory, we may well suppose that his earlier efforts were more carefully elaborated and less discursive than those of his later times. In the one period he had his reputation to acquire; in the other it was already won. Nevertheless, the outlines originally sketched underwent frequent changes and amplifications in successive editions, and were filled up and deepened by subsequent investigations. They contained, however, the enunciation of his novel views, and laid down the principles of his historical philosophy, and it is therefore appropriate to introduce at this place our observations on the great work, which he lived to revise more than once, but did not live to finish.

His Roman history was the labour of his life. His heart was wrapped up in it, all his studies converged toward it, and his reputation with posterity will rest almost entirely upon it, notwithstanding the various and valuable services which he rendered to his own generation as a statesman, financier, and diplomatist. His first wife, on her death-bed, (she died June 21, 1815,) requested, as the last favour, that he should finish his history whether she lived or died;[†] and, although grief at first, occupation and distraction afterward, and his own premature decease prevented the full accomplishment of the task, he always cherished it henceforth as a sacred duty, no less than as his true vocation.

Was the result worthy of the life-long effort? Was it such as to justify the devotion of Niebuhr's talents, erudition and time to its

---

[*] Lucan, Pharsal., vii, 391. We have substituted "erat" for "erit" in the quotation.

[†] Niebuhr's Life, p. 289.

accomplishment? Is the unfinished monument which he has left behind him an adequate achievement for the labours of such a man? The sentence of the learned has already been rendered; and, notwithstanding the cavils of some of his contemporaries, and the still subsisting disputes in regard to some of his positions, the judgment of scholars has been almost unanimous in regarding Niebuhr's History of Rome as the greatest of all acquisitions for the just comprehension of ancient history; and as constituting by itself a marked and brilliant era in the course of historical speculation.

Niebuhr's History of Rome is scarcely calculated to attract the admiration of any but professed scholars or conscientious historical students; nor are its high excellences apparent to any others. The necessary exuberance of the criticism renders it tedious, and exacts an amount of patient attention and continued appreciation which unpleasantly arrests the narrative, and renders its perusal irksome to those who do not undertake it as a regular study. And yet there are passages of true eloquence to be found in its pages; broad and comprehensive views which extend through the whole domain of time, and penetrate into the most recondite secrets of political and social organization. Ample as is the canvass afforded by the growth and progress of the conquerors of the world, (terrarum dominis,) full of incidents as is the story of their march to universal empire, Niebuhr, who regarded modern history as almost worthless,* has frequently and gracefully transcended the natural limits of his picture: and, while thus more effectually illustrating the fortunes of the Romans, has diffused a brilliant light over other nations, and over mediæval and recent times. One of the most remarkable characteristics of his great production is the fulness and semi-prophetic perspicuity of vision which is displayed throughout.

As the magic stone of eastern fable enabled the Calender to behold the vast treasures hidden in the bosom of the earth, so the perusal of Niebuhr's History dispels the clouds of darkness, and enables us, too, to penetrate into the secrets of time and the mysteries of national change. This merit, however, is not the most prominent or direct service rendered by him. Rome was his subject, and it is in connexion with Rome, that we must seek for his most immediate achievements.

What Cicero had undertaken as a Utopian dream in the dying agonies of the Republic, in order to recall his countrymen to a sense of patriotism and an admiration of the past, and at the same time to relieve his own deep mortification by the pleasure, so highly prized by Livy, of contemplating the fancied glories of a better age, Nie-

---

* Letter lxxxi, p. 143: "Modern history ne vaut pas le diable."

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

buhr undertook from the love of truth, and with the design of correcting error, and retracing the true lineaments of Roman development. Cicero drew the outlines of an imaginary republic and called it ancestral Rome. He worked the misplaced and misapprehended fragments of the traditionary institutions into a new and ideal structure. Niebuhr studied in the shattered remnants the true constitution of the state, in order to exhibit the life, explain the actions, expound the growth, and rectify the history of the Roman people. This is the central, though not the most obvious idea in Niebuhr's History of Rome. This was his great project of reconstruction. Around this all his other labours were clustered.

But, though such was the main purpose distinctly contemplated from the first, it was not the first accomplished; nor was it ever entirely completed. He lived long enough, however, to show what was to be done, and to show how it was to be done. The misconception of the constitutional usages, and the internal and external action of Rome in its maturity, was linked with and dependent upon a long series of errors and misrepresentations descending from the earliest to the very latest times. They reached far beyond the term which Niebuhr assigned for his own investigations; and their latest developments have not yet been exposed. The legends of a Trojan settlement in Italy, and of the Trojan origin of Rome; the ignorance and confusion relative to the races which inhabited the peninsula, and successively came in collision with the Romans; the mythical tales of the regal dynasty; the Sabine and Etruscan wars; the original organization and early revolutions of the state; the causes, consequences, and character of the revolt against the monarchy; the early relations of the patricians and plebeians; the real and the fabulous connexions with Greece; the comitia and the distribution of land; the domestic and foreign wars; their conduct and their effects; the condition of the citizens; the religion of the state; the jurisprudence and other institutions of the nation; the moral sentiment of the people; the changes of the constitution; the regulation of the calendar; the character of the public archives—all these exhibited so many different but connected occasions of error. They had never been justly apprehended by the incurious criticisms of the prejudiced and hasty rhetoricians who in ancient times had undertaken to write the history of Rome; and they had been misrepresented, and exhibited with a singular mixture of distorted truth and exaggerated fable by the successive generations of compilers who had copied from the earlier chroniclers.

The error and the injury do not terminate here. A like stream of misconception, varying in volume and character as it proceeds,

pervades the story of the later ages of the Republic, and of its transition to an imperial form. It runs through the chronicle of the empire, and leaves the last struggles of the universal monarchy unexplained and unintelligible. These later periods, however, are not included in Niebuhr's labours. A brief sketch of the empire down to the reign of Constantine is, indeed, afforded by his lectures; but his original investigations do not extend beyond the Punic wars.

The Roman history of Niebuhr has been too often regarded as merely a criticism, and it has not been sufficiently recognised that, however large a portion was devoted to the refutation of current error, the scope and purpose of the work was to create anew the narrative of Roman greatness. Diligently gathering together from all sources the multifarious materials which might serve for the illustration of his subject; collating, correcting, and combining his multitudinous authorities; never yielding to the prestige of a name, and never neglecting the least fragment which might elucidate a difficulty, he traced the occasion and explained the reception of the errors he exposed, and divined the truth from the reciprocal relations of the different types of falsehood. In this manner he was successful in separating the right from the wrong, in dispelling illusions by the evidence of the illusions themselves; and in disentangling the facts from the fables in which they were enveloped. By this difficult and delicate process of induction, which, in the first treatment of such a subject, could be safely handled only by a mind of wonderful sagacity, tenacity, and rigour, he pierced through the darkness which shrouded the earliest ages of Italy; through the fictions which hovered around the infancy of Rome; and through the ignorance and delusion which darkened her later history. Thus he distinguished between the old poetic legends and their actual significance: stripping the latter of its deceptive hues and false presentiment, and restoring the former to the grace and ideality of their native character. So far from destroying the poetry of the earlier ages, and reducing their rich imaginations to plain and prosaic reality, Niebuhr gave back to poetry what rightfully belonged to its dominion, and exhibited the legends in their legendary form. It was those who had combined, and those who still desired to combine, the heterogeneous elements of historic facts and mythical representations who crushed and annihilated both by their procedure. Niebuhr did full justice to both: it would have been strange if, with his imaginative tendencies, he had sacrificed the ideal in order to render vain his pursuit of the real. He only distinguished clearly between them, and left each in its own independent existence; thus meriting under a double title the credit of being,

"Primo pictor delle memorie antiche."

So far we have considered only Niebuhr's mode of gathering and dealing with his materials; attention should also be paid to the manner in which he adapted the negative procedure of criticism to the positive purposes of construction. In the discharge of the latter and higher function analogy was his principal instrument; but it was an analogical method so judiciously employed, and exercised on such a copious array of instances furnished by his ever-ready erudition, that it always resembled and was often identical with induction. Thus he introduced science into the domain of history: or rather achieved, what Vico had aspired to, the successful conversion of history into the form of science. In this most original portion of his labours his vast and varied learning, his intimate acquaintance with all branches of geography and history, his luminous practical philosophy, his diversified and extended familiarity with men and nations, with the machinery and operations of government, all contributed essential aid to his designs. In estimating the conduct of contemporary men, he tells us that he was in the habit of placing himself ideally in their position, and inquiring what course he should pursue with the same character, purposes, and opportunities, and that thus he had foreseen many of the details of Napoleon's career and campaigns.* He pursued a somewhat analogous mode of reasoning in reconstructing the history of Rome, endeavoured to place himself in the position of a contemporary of the times which he described, and then considered what must have been the action of the Romans to be in accordance with the national character, with the condition and powers of the people, and with the laws of social and political development. Thus, where his witnesses failed him, or were calculated to lead him astray, his philosophical method served as a conjuring rod to evoke the shades of departed generations, and to extract a true response from the dead. We have already intimated that the same prophetic faculty is required for the just interpretation of the past as for the divination of the future; and that Niebuhr's lively imagination was one of his highest qualifications as a historian. Both positions are illustrated and confirmed by the character and truth of his Roman history.

Niebuhr did not live to complete his task, nor even to prepare for publication the last volume which he composed; but he did all that was absolutely requisite to point out the true road to others. Perhaps even the earliest promulgation of his views in the University of Berlin might have been sufficient for this purpose; but he fortunately lived long enough to expand and elaborate his doctrines,

---

* Letter ccxc, p. 433.

and to extend his performance much beyond its original limits. Moreover, when we compare the meagreness, the want of accuracy, the insufficient citation of authorities which characterize his lectures as published from the notes of his pupils, with the richness, the faithful caution, and the exuberant erudition of his finished volumes, we must regard the completion of a part of his proposed task as equally requisite for an example and for the establishment of his own reputation.

Soon after the delivery of his first course of lectures, he began to prepare the first volume of his history for the press. It was printed toward the close of 1811, and met with general admiration and approval. During that winter he continued his lectures, and arranged a second volume for publication. It appeared in the course of 1812; but the gloom which enveloped the continent at that time denied to it at once the flattering reception which its author's temperament desired. He proceeded, however, with the composition of a third volume, but was interrupted in his labours by the exciting and agitating events which accompanied the insurgence of the Prussians against the French domination, after the disastrous termination of the Russian campaign. The Landwehr was called out; Niebuhr sent in his name as a volunteer, and commenced practising the manual exercise, though desiring to serve as secretary to the general staff, or to obtain a commission in the regular army. The king refused his request, but promised him more suitable employment. Swift, as a colonel of horse, would scarcely have been a more anomalous phenomenon than Niebuhr as a captain of Prussian grenadiers.

The king redeemed his promise; and, instead of leaving Niebuhr "to writing and to serving as a common soldier," as he complained that "fate had so ordained,"* he summoned him to Dresden in April, 1813, and placed him on the central commission appointed to administer the German provinces reconquered from France. The retreat of the French restored him to Berlin; but his political functions were continued by the draft of a constitution for Holland, which appears not to have been accepted. He was also requested to give instruction to the crown prince, in finance; an office which he discharged with pleasure, and so as to secure the grateful regards of his royal pupil.

Domestic and other cares, however, multiplied around him; the return of Napoleon from Elba agitated once more the continent, and interrupted Niebuhr's literary pursuits; the declining health of his wife required his constant attention; and in the midst of his anxie-

---

* Letter clxiv, p. 257.

ties the intelligence of the death of his father fell heavily and suddenly upon him. His wife's life was not prolonged much longer. She died in the summer of 1815. Niebuhr was deeply grieved at the loss of a wife he had so fondly and proudly cherished; but having been appointed ambassador to Rome, he solaced his wounded feelings, or provided for his official comfort, by marrying in the course of his year of mourning, Margaret Hensler, a near connexion of his departed spouse. During the period of his grief he prepared himself for his embassy by the diligent study of the canon law; wrote an admirable and affectionate biography of his father; united with Heindorf and Buttmann in editing the newly-discovered Fronto; and composed several essays on various subjects. In addition to these multifarious labours, he served as one of the royal commissioners for drafting a new constitution for Prussia.[*] His whole life was employed in occupations which enlarged his qualifications as a great historian; and trained him, by practical experience as a financier and a statesman, by personal observation of the scene of Roman life, by antiquarian research, linguistic accomplishments, and practice in composition, to become the best, the truest, the most comprehensive historian of Rome.

In July, 1816, Niebuhr commenced his pilgrimage to Rome as ambassador of Prussia. The instructions for the special mission on which he was sent should have followed him in a few weeks, but did not arrive for four years. When Hardenberg visited the pontifical city in February, 1821, he resigned to him the honour and credit of concluding the negotiations with the papal court; which had been rendered possible by the frankness, candour, and sincerity of his long intercourse with the high dignitaries of the Church and State, and by the esteem with which he had inspired them. In the May of 1823, after an absence of nearly seven years, he left the city of Consuls, Cæsars, and Popes, on his homeward journey. At the last moment, he abandoned it with regret. "It goes to my very heart," says he, "to think that this is the last letter I shall write you from Rome."[†] Everything appeared to him in brighter colours than before, when he was leaving the country, as he truly prognosticated, forever. But the health of his wife, and the prospects of his son, demanded, in his estimation, a return to Germany. He appreciated the advantages and the position he resigned; but his life had been in great measure free from ambition, and he estimated the private duties of life as more important than those which were public, except in extraordinary times.[‡]

On his journey to Rome, he discovered and partly deciphered at

[*] Letter cci, p. 301. [†] Letter ~~cccxviii, p. 442.~~ [‡] Life, p. 416.

Verona, the long-lost and inestimable Institutes of Gaius. He was in raptures at the discovery, for he appreciated its full importance. It has given birth to a new era in the study of Roman jurisprudence; and constitutes the most valuable of all recent additions to our stores of classic literature. In announcing to Savigny the treasure which he had unveiled, he writes, "Now, dear Savigny, here lies a treasure waiting for your hands to dig it up; a bait that shall lure you over the Alps to us. Or will you give the necessary instructions to Cramer to set to work? Or will you persuade some one else to come? You will never suffer this discovery, which is exactly what you have been wishing for so ardently, to be lost for the want of some one to make use of it."* The result of the discovery is familiar to every jurist and every scholar.

In Rome he discovered among the palimpsests fragments of Cicero's orations, of Livy, Seneca, and Hyginus; and on his homeward journey detected among the MSS. of the ancient library at St. Gall, (so celebrated in the middle ages, and illustrated at the restoration of learning by Poggio Bracciolini's discovery there of the MS. of Quintilian,†) the Panegyrics of Merobaudes, which he edited a second time for the Bonn edition of the Corpus Scriptorum Historiæ Byzantinæ. He, perhaps, over-estimated the value of these fragments, which are often unintelligible from mutilation, and rarely instructive; but we can readily sympathize with him in the motives of his exultation.

There are many interesting circumstances connected with Niebuhr's residence in Rome which we should gladly notice did our space permit; the kindness and countenance which he showed to poor strangers; the cordial encouragement and friendship which he extended to the young German artists, who afterward created a brilliant school of art in Germany; his protection and patronage of our estimable and learned friend, Dr. Lieber, on his hazardous return from the Phil-Hellenic campaign in Greece; his domestic life and recreations; his social intercourse with the papal court and with all who could worthily claim his regards; his reception of Von Stein, Hardenberg, and the crown prince of Prussia; his studies, and his opinions; but we have not the time to dwell upon them. They may be learnt from the letters written during this period, from the Chevalier Bunsen's interesting sketch of Niebuhr as a diplomatist in Rome, appended to this volume, and from Lieber's reminiscences of Niebuhr.

---

* Letter ccxiii, p. 320.

† A. D. 1416. Shepherd's Life of Poggio Bracciolini, c. iii, p. 97-104. Spalding, Præf. ad Quintilian.

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

On his return to Prussia, Niebuhr visited Bonn for the purpose of renewing his acquaintance with his friend and former secretary, Professor Brandis. He was so much pleased with the city, that he determined to select it as his future residence. He recommenced the prosecution of his history, which had not been continued during his mission to Rome; but was interrupted first by his own indisposition, afterward by sickness in his family. In May, 1824, he returned to Berlin; and during the summer resigned his place as ambassador, having heretofore obtained only leave of absence, and not a release from his diplomatic post. He was allowed a retiring pension equivalent to his salary before leaving Berlin; and with this for his support, intended to settle his family permanently at Bonn, but he was employed some time longer in the service of government, as a councillor of State, and afterward as commissioner to deliberate on the organization of a national bank, and to reform the tenure of land among the Westphalian peasantry.

As soon as he was released from these official duties, Niebuhr retired to Bonn, and there spent the scanty remainder of his life. Without having any official appointment in the young university of that city, he delivered regular courses of lectures on the history and antiquities of Greece and Rome, which were continued till the period of his death. In the October of 1825, after the long intermission of ten years, he resumed methodically the composition of his great history Other associations and anxieties had arrested his labours before: and even now he was destined not to continue them to their close. His friend and pupil, Professor Haysen, revised and prepared for publication the manuscript of the third volume, so often commenced, so often interrupted.

> "Bis conatus erat casus effingere in auro;
> Bis patriæ cecidere manus."

It was not twice only, but many times that Niebuhr's hands had been compelled to desist from their labour, which remained in the end unfinished. Still during three years much was done. The MS. of the third volume was very nearly perfected, and a new and much improved edition of the two already published was issued from the press.

The history of Rome did not so entirely engross Niebuhr's attention as to prevent him from entertaining other literary enterprises. He originated a new edition of the Byzantine historians; wrote a prospectus of the undertaking, and contributed to the collection editions by himself of Agathias Merobaudes, Constantinus Porphyrogenitus De Cœrimoniis, with the unpublished portions of

Reiske's Commentary, and of the Fragments of Eunapius, Menander, &c. The project, if it had been properly executed, was calculated to render essential service to historical science. There was no complete edition of the numerous and unequal writers who illustrate copiously the whole history of the Byzantine empire, from the foundation of Constantinople by Constantine the Great, to its capture under Constantine Palæologus; there is no such edition even yet. The imperfect collections issued from the royal press at Paris, and republished at Venice, were rare, expensive, and cumbrous. The separate editions of the various authors were costly, of very unequal merit, and of difficult attainment. The Bonn edition is more complete, convenient, and moderate in cost than its predecessors. It is not yet finished, but may drag its slow length along for another generation, at its present rate of increase.

Madame Niebuhr's health was a cause of much uneasiness to her husband: and other distresses and anxieties multiplied around him. On the night of the 6th of February, 1830, his house in Bonn was burnt down. His books, and the manuscript of a revised copy of the second volume of his history were fortunately saved from the flames. While calmly watching the progress of destruction, he had exclaimed, "If only the manuscript of the second volume of my Roman history is found again, I can get over everything else." The foundations of a new and larger house were laid, but Niebuhr did not live to enjoy it. The French Revolution of July broke out; it was a crushing blow to one whose whole being was so deeply impregnated with gloomy anticipations of the future. It confirmed all his forebodings. He had long regarded European civilization as in a state of hopeless decline; at times he had struggled successfully to shake off this conviction, but the new outburst of revolution recalled, and deepened his forebodings. He anticipated the ultimate establishment of a military despotism in France; the convulsion, anarchy, and rebellion of the German States; and the final domination of Russia. He saw that the revolution commenced threatened social order, and the institution of property, and he looked forward to the repetition of the scenes of decaying Rome. Subsequent events have justified his apprehensions, and verified his previsions. The history of the last ten years, and of the coming ten is written in his last letter to Moltke, and is illustrated by the scattered views diffused through his earlier letters and other writings. What he shuddered to see in the visions of his imagination, he was spared from witnessing in the reality. Death dropped the curtain on the scene.

The deep interest which Niebuhr took in the developments of the

second French Revolution, and especially in the trial of the ex-ministers, led him every evening to the public reading-rooms, to look carefully over the papers after the crowd had finished their perusal. On the evening of Christmas day, he had been thus employed for a long time in the news-room, which was very hot and close, without taking off his thick fur cloak. The piercing frost of the wintry night received him on his return home, heated in mind and body. He complained of a severe chill, and retired at once to bed; which he never left again, except for a single hour. An illness of one week carried him to the grave. Two days before his death, his wife, broken in spirits, strength and health, was obliged to leave him, and betake herself to a sick bed. "Hapless house!" exclaimed Niebuhr, with his usual presentiment of the future, when apprised of the cause of her absence, "to lose father and mother at once!" About midnight of the 1st of January, 1831, he sank back on his pillow, conscious of his rapidly approaching end, and in another hour was at rest forever.

Nine days later, and at nearly the same hour of the night, his wife expired. Pneumonia was the immediate occasion of the death of both; but a broken spirit was the ultimate cause of the decease of the husband, and a broken heart of that of the wife. They were buried in one grave, over which a monument has been erected by the present king of Prussia to the memory of his teacher, his councillor, and his friend.

We cannot prolong our remarks by gathering together into a focus the characteristics of Niebuhr. We must forego the pleasure of expatiating on the integrity, simplicity, and sincerity of his nature; the unaffected kindliness and fidelity of his disposition; his firm, frank, and generous temper; his contempt of meanness; his enthusiasm in the cause of right; his warm and genial affections; his simple tastes; his fondness for children; his sobriety of thought and judgment; and those other high qualities which constitute, not a perfect, but a truly good man. He was one of the rare instances in which greatness was achieved through the instrumentality of goodness, and whose goodness was not impaired by his greatness.

Art. IV.—JEPHTHAH'S VOW.

The supposed immolation of Jephthah's daughter has been strenuously urged, by the oppugners of divine revelation, as a capital objection to the morality of the Bible. This consideration alone is sufficient to invest the exposition of Judges xi, 29–40, with the highest importance. The usual interpretations of that deeply interesting narrative may be resolved into two opposing theories—that of *immolation* and that of *consecration*. Among divines and Biblical critics, distinguished names of equal eminence for talent, piety, and intelligence, are found arranged in support of both these theories of interpretation; while Josephus, it is well known, positively asserts the immolation of the daughter of this judge in Israel. To this theory of exposition Dr. Kitto not only subscribes, but assumes the personal responsibility of the doctrine contained in the article "Jephthah," as it is not credited to any of the learned contributors to the "Cyclopedia of Biblical Literature." That the authority of such a name, on either side of the question, is not inconsiderable, will not be questioned. But the question, as to the nature of this vow, must, after all, be decided, not by authority, but by the weight of argument in support of the assumed facts in the case. This will justify a careful re-examination of the whole matter, together with Dr. Kitto's argument in support of the immolation hypothesis.

There are two sources of difficulty in determining the real character of the vow—the extreme brevity of the narration, and the remoteness of the period when the event occurred. Its high antiquity invests it with a degree of obscurity which the brief reference of the historian leaves quite unremoved. And that either of the current hypotheses is entirely unembarrassed is more than can be claimed. But left to the necessity of balancing probabilities, and of chosing between alternatives, that theory of exposition will command our concurrence which presents the fewest difficulties, and which is sustained by the highest probability.

That there is a connexion, intimate and vital, if not inseparable, between the character of Jephthah and the nature of his vow, will not be disputed. And what this was, is more easily determined than some other points in the narrative; since what was left obscure by the sacred historian has been amply cleared up by the inspired apostle. From his character, then, we assume that his vow was a pious act. It was indisputably such in his own intention, and such,

also, as to the circumstances under which it was made. Both go to establish his piety, while the latter were more marked and solemn. Let us briefly recount them. He was summoned from his retreat in Tob to the headship of the martial forces of Israel in repelling the invasion of the Ammonites. The specified conditions on which he had consented to take the direction of affairs at this critical juncture were acceded to by the people, and the covenant between him and them had been confirmed by an oath. The whole transaction had been recounted "before the Lord in Mizpeh." The attempt to terminate the invasion by negotiation proving abortive, and "the Spirit of the Lord" coming upon him, he promptly addressed himself to the arduous work of vanquishing the invaders, and of retrieving the fortunes of his country. His chief reliance for success was upon the arm of God. To secure the favour of Heaven upon the enterprise, and as a proof of his confidence in that favour, he made the vow in question.

Granting the piety of the act, where is the proof that his piety was not as enlightened and rational, at least for his times, and the dispensation under which he lived, as it was ardent and confiding? Of the pure and elevated character of his faith we have the testimony of the apostle, Heb. xi, 32. He is placed with David, Samuel. Gideon, Barak, and Samson, all honourable as being eminent examples of "faith." But how does this testimony to this eminent grace accord with the hypothesis that he immolated his daughter? On this theory, here is an act and a trait of character utterly irreconcilable! On this supposition he must have sacrificed her either to Moloch, the heathen god of the Ammonites, the hated enemies of the Hebrews, or to the God of Israel. That human sacrifices were offered to Moloch is an indisputed fact in sacred history. The law of the Hebrews (Lev. xviii, 21) specifically inhibited them from causing their children to "pass through the fire" to this god. How absurd to suppose that despicable as the Ammonites were to the Israelites on account of their gross idolatry and its cruel rites, now doubly so by this unprovoked invasion of the inheritance given their fathers, that this judge, prince, and general should first consult the God of his fathers, and then sacrifice his daughter to the revengeful god of his enemies! Where is the evidence that either in making or in paying his vow he copied the example of these most besotted idolaters? Besides, he was well versed in the history of Divine providence toward the Canaanites who were exterminated for their idolatry. Neither could he need instruction as to the requisitions of the law respecting sacrifice. He knew that *human* sacrifice would be even a greater abomination to God than that of any

unclean animal. Hence it is not conceivable that he should obligate himself, in any contingency which might arise, in making a vow to the Lord, to do that to *secure* the divine favour which he knew must be most *offensive* to him. How could he have acted so preposterous a part as to have offered his daughter to Moloch, or to have offered *such* a sacrifice to the Jehovah? And that there must have been some qualification to his vow, latent or implied, beyond what appears in the narrative, is evident from the absurdity of taking the words of the vow in their literal acceptation. On his return some *person* might have "come first out of the doors of his house," over whom he had no legal control; some neighbor, man or woman. His vow of course could not embrace them. It might be a *dog*, or some unclean animal, in which case it could not be offered, but must be redeemed, and the price devoted to a sacred purpose. Such a conditionality in his vow, implied if not expressed, must have been involved.

This conditionality will be evinced by a reference to the Hebrew text. It cannot be denied that the particle וְ *ve*, *and*, is used both in a copulative and disjunctive sense by Hebrew writers. See Exod. xxi, 17, and Lev. xxvii, 28. Separating the pronoun from the rest, and referring it to "Lord" as its antecedent, and leaving out "for," which is not in the Hebrew, the passage literally rendered would be: "shall be the Lord's; or I will Him a burnt-offering." In the Septuagint it stands thus: *ἔσται τῷ κυρίῳ, ἀνοίσω αυτὸν ὁλοκαύτωμα.* Judges xi, 31.

But says Dr. Kitto: "The explanation which denies this [the immolation of Jephthah's daughter] maintains that she was rather doomed to perpetual celibacy; and this it appears to us, on the strength of phrases which, to one who really understands the character of the Hebrew people and their language, suggests nothing more than that it was considered a lamentable thing for any daughter of Israel to die childless. To *live* unmarried was required by no law, custom, or devotement among the Jews; no one had the right to impose so odious a condition on another, nor is any such condition implied or expressed in the vow which Jephthah uttered."

This passage contains the strength of the argument of the doctor for immolation. An important concession is, at least, implied in the statement: "That it was considered reproachful for any daughter of Israel to die childless." And if the advocates of the *consecration* hypothesis can show that the perpetual celibacy of Jephthah's daughter would be in accordance with the provisions of the law of Moses, they may claim possibility for their exposition. Should

they be able to show this state highly probable, they advance another step toward certainty in their conclusion.

Consulting the law of a Nazarite, Num. vi, 2–12, it is clear that woman as well as man might come under its provisions: "When either man or woman shall separate themselves to vow a vow of a Nazarite, to separate themselves unto the Lord," &c. From this glance at the preface to this law, which, to save space, we do not transcribe, two things are clear: 1. That the vow of a Nazarite was common to both sexes. 2. That all who took it upon them were consecrated or "separated unto the Lord." It was a setting apart, a separation from things secular, a devotion to things sacred, a consecration exclusively to the service of God. When we take into consideration that this law, a statute of Moses, had been in force in Israel some three hundred years, it lends no feeble support to the hypothesis that this daughter of Israel was in some such way "separated unto the Lord." Nor is the probability materially impaired by the fact that so little is said in Jewish history respecting the Nazariteship of women. It is enough that they were embraced by the law regulating that state. And who can show that celibacy was not held obligatory upon all who entered into the Nazarite vow during the term of its continuance? If this cannot be done, the probability cannot be denied, nor is there the least absurdity in the admission of its high probability. And the phrase, "it was a custom in Israel," verse 39, may refer to female Nazarites: because it may as legitimately relate to the declaration respecting Jephthah's daughter immediately preceding, as to an entirely different subject in verse 40. In Dr. Clarke's note on the passage the reader will find this reference adopted by that eminent commentator.

The argument on this point—that one *had* the right among the Jews of "imposing so odious a condition as celibacy upon another"—will be strengthened to a degree little short of conclusiveness by a glance at that section of the law which provides for the consecration, by vow, of a *child*, by its father, to the service of God. It is contained in Lev. xxvii, under the title of a *singular vow.* The law provides for the estimation of the amount at which the child or the adult might be exonerated from the personal discharge of such vow by a commutation in money, as an equivalent for the service due, whether the devotement was made by the parent or by the individual himself. The estimation contemplated three distinct periods, which, taken together, would amount in aggregrate to the whole effective term of ordinary life. The period most available for effective service is first estimated, namely, from twenty to sixty years of age. As

this term of forty years was in that age, and still is, by far the most vigorous and useful in life, the estimated commutation is more than twice that of any other term of years estimated. The next period estimated was from five to twenty years of age; the next from one month to five years. Thus from one month to five years, from five years to twenty, from twenty to sixty, were the three periods for which an estimate providing for commutation in the discharge of a vow was fixed by law. What might remain of life above sixty years of age would be uncertain as to its duration, and as to the vigour of the person, under the accumulating pressure of infirmities; leaving the amount of available service extremely contingent. Hence, in foresight of this, though an amount in commutation is named, a *proviso* is added for abatement on the plea of inability to pay—a question to be decided by the priests. Lev. xxvii, 3–8.

From this is it not clear that the father by vow might consecrate his child to the service of God, or his sanctuary, from the age of one month to twenty years, or during life? Nor can there be a reasonable doubt that it lay in his own breast to make such singular vow more or less stringent. And, for aught that appears, he might impose upon his daughter the obligation of perpetual celibacy; if, indeed, this were not necessarily included in her "separation to the Lord." Her standing in this relation to God may have been deemed of itself incompatible with the conjugal relation. If this were included in the vow as such, there could be no release during the child's minority, except at the instance of the father; and then only by paying the estimated commutation. After reaching its majority, and after the death of the parent, the person under the vow might be released at his or her option by paying the estimation. But whether the parent or the child at any age would use this legal provision, would depend upon contingencies which will readily suggest themselves to the reflecting reader.

Once more. An important distinction should here be noticed between the "singular vow," in Lev. xxvii, 2, and the "devoted thing," in verse 28. The former might be cancelled by paying the legal estimate or commutation. The devotement admitted of no such exoneration. All vows seem to have been included in these two classes; and to which that of Jephthah belonged remains to be seen. A reference to the original will show that both in Judges xi, 30, where his vow is described, and in Lev. xxvii, 2, where we have the law providing for commutation as above explained, נֶדֶר *ne-der, a vow*, is the word used. In verse 28 we have חֵרֶם *herem, a devotement, a thing devoted to a good or bad purpose.* This distinction is equally marked in the Septuagint; *εὐχὴν, a vow*, occurs in the

two former passages, while in the latter we have *ἀνάθημα, a thing or person devoted to holy purposes, a victim devoted to destruction.* In the former case the vow admitted of commutation; in the latter the devotement must be inviolate. To this the Vulgate also corresponds, having *votum, a vow*, in the two former passages, and *quod consecratur, a consecrated or devoted thing*, in the latter. Hence it is clear that Jephthah's vow belonged to the class of commutable vows. We also learn that it was competent for the father to bind his child by his vow from the age of one month to five years, or to the end of life, from the personal obligation of which exoneration could be obtained only by conformity to the provisions of law. These facts, brought to the exposition of this interesting narrative, shed much light upon some of its obscure statements. Thus, when she met her father, who stated what had passed his lips, from which he said "he could not go back," she promptly declared her cheerful and hearty concurrence; in which, whether she appeared more *filial* or *pious*, it is not easy to determine.

Comparing the law of a Nazarite with the law respecting a "*singular vow*," any one can see how far Dr. Kitto is warranted in saying: "To *live* unmarried was required by no law, custom, or devotement, among the Jews." Because for this to be "required" is one thing; and for continuance in this state to be *incidental* to the subject of a "singular" or Nazarite vow, made and executed under the provisions of law, "in such cases made and provided," is quite another. The denial of this is more than any advocate of the immolation hypothesis would be willing to aver.

The remark of Dr. Kitto, that "to get rid of a difficulty which has no place in the text, but arises from our reluctance to receive that text in its obvious meaning, we invent a new thing in Israel—a thing never heard of among the Hebrews, in ancient or modern times, and more opposed to their peculiar notions than anything the wit of man ever devised;" if it contain argument at all, contains something besides argument. As to getting "rid of a difficulty," are there none on the immolation hypothesis? Does an open sea spread out in the direction of that theory? When the commendation of Jephthah's faith by the apostle is harmonized with the immolation exposition, it will be time enough to inquire how the advocates of the consecration interpretation "get rid of the difficulties in the text." The reader will judge whether the advocates of immolation or consecration are more justly open to the imputation of extravagant and witty inventions. It is generally unfortunate for such sweeping assertions that they may be retorted with all their

force upon those who utter them. They prove nothing, unless naked assertion is proof. But why, on the immolation hypothesis, did Jephthah's daughter request a respite of "two months, that she might go up and down upon the mountains, and bewail her virginity with her fellows?" Who can help inquiring, Why not much rather bewail her *death?* Her own allusion to her virginity—rather, her celibacy—with the reference to it in the next two verses, admitting her immolation, makes a mere circumstance more deplorable than the loss of life itself! If this would not be to magnify "the weaker into the stronger reason," it is inconceivable what should be so regarded.

"Reluctance to receive the text in its obvious meaning," may be retorted with double stringency upon the advocates of immolation. Why evince so much "reluctance" to *relinquish* an interpretation of a dark and difficult passage in an isolated and brief narrative, especially when such interpretation, called the "obvious meaning," so manifestly neutralizes and outrages all just claims to *piety* on Jephthah's part; substituting for it the grossest superstition of the most blind and reckless worshipper of Moloch, thus coming in direct and open conflict with all the purest and deepest sentiments of the paternal heart: and this allowed to pass, not only without a word of reprobation, or even so much as one allusive censure by the inspired writers, but the faith of this judge of Israel receiving in the meantime the highest commendation! If difficulties like these rank not among the "insuperable," we cannot imagine what should be so considered. And all, let it be remembered, is based upon the interpretation of a solitary Hebrew text which some of the most celebrated Biblical critics and commentators maintain is susceptible of a translation more literal, involving no such consequences: for it is obvious that all that is said in allusion to this vow, after the statement of the utterance of the vow itself, accords quite as well with the consecration exposition, to say the least, as with the immolation hypothesis. It is passing strange, though true, that a seeming predilection for the marvellous and the tragical should maintain such a dominion over the popular mind; a propensity which is greatly cherished by giving this Scripture narrative what is claimed to be the "obvious meaning." Could it be shown that the view which strikes the great mass of ordinary readers really favours immolation—which we are not prepared to concede—this should still go for nothing, yea, less than nothing, in opposition to a sober, intelligent, critical investigation of the *law* and the *facts* in the case: because to substitute the "obvious" for the critical import of a passage of Scripture, would be at once to repudiate all

research and intelligent Biblical exegesis; to transfer our confidence for the needful guidance on all questions of intricacy, doubt, or difficulty, from the learned, laborious, and scrutinizing, to the mass of unscrupulous and superficial readers; persons who are wont to take up first impressions instead of tracing out ultimate truths, or comparing separate acts or principles with the analogy of faith or consistency of character; seldom searching below the surface for a solid foundation for the superstructure of their opinions. It would be to adopt a maxim in Biblical exposition fatal to truth on all great questions relative to religion, politics, the arts and sciences—questions involving the most vital interests of mankind; a doctrine to which, when placed in a clear light, Dr. K. would be the last to subscribe. Hence we are compelled to dissent from his position, both as respects the conclusion he arrives at, and the reasoning by which it is reached. "But," he adds, "the more the plain rules of common sense have been exercised in our views of Biblical transactions; and the better we succeed in realizing a distinct idea of the times in which Jephthah lived, and of the position he occupied, the less reluctance there has been to admit the interpretation which the first view of the passage suggests to every reader, which is, that he really did offer her in sacrifice."

On this we remark, finally, that while we go for the adoption of the "plain rules of common sense" in ascertaining correct "views in Biblical transactions," and for "realizing a distinct idea of the times and position of Jephthah," we have *more* instead of "less reluctance" to admit an interpretation of his vow which involves the morality of an act of one so highly commended by an inspired writer, and thus confirming the captious sceptic in his cavil against the morality of the Bible, whatever may chance to have been our "first" view of the matter; especially when a more comprehensive critical investigation of the whole subject compels us to exonerate this honoured parent from so vile an imputation. With us vastly more reliance should be placed upon sober, intelligent, patient, sacred thought, in such examples of obscurity and difficulty, than upon mere first views: not, however, because we esteem the "plain, common sense first views of ordinary readers" *less*, but because we appreciate the diligent research, the rigid and enlightened scrutiny of the pious, intelligent, critical Biblical student *more*. On this ground we cheerfully place the two theories, leaving the reader to decide the issue.

Art. V.—THE GEOLOGY OF WORDS.

1. *Trench on the Study of Words.* New-York: 12mo., pp. 236.
2. *Epea Pteroenta, or the Diversions of Purley.* By John Horne Tooke.
3. *Fowler on the English Language.* New-York: Harper & Brothers; 8vo., pp. 675.
4. *Bartlett's Dictionary of Americanisms.* New-York: 8vo.
5. *Richardson's English Dictionary.* London: 4to.

When an ordinary workman digs out from the quarry a block of sand-stone, it may seem to him but so many square feet of rock that may be used in building a wall. If his attention should be attracted to the curious marks that appear on its surface, they will do little more than excite a momentary curiosity. But let the keen eyes of a Hugh Miller or an Agassiz rest upon this rock, and it becomes instantly a record of the deepest significance. These mysterious marks become hieroglyphics instinct with meaning; and in tracing them out there is revealed the history of an undated past. In the curling surface of the rock the geologist detects the ripple-marks that tell the story of an ancient sea that rolled its peaceful waves along the beach during the long, still summer night, and of the morning breeze that covered gently with the sifted sand the traces of this rippling tide, and sealed them up in perpetual remembrance. In the dotted marks that indent it, he sees the trace of the pattering rain-drops that came suddenly down from the summer sky upon the smooth, dry strand, and passing quickly away, left braided on the retiring cloud that beautiful bow that was afterward selected by God as the symbol of hope to man. And as he looks yet closer, he finds the footprints of living things that have here daguerreotyped themselves to distant generations. A yet further examination reveals to him the very forms of the ancient dwellers in these waters; entombed in this enduring sarcophagus, and presenting in strong hieroglyphics at once their biography and their epitaph. In the structure of their jaws, and the contents of their stomachs, they betray the nature of their food; in the forms of their fins and skeletons, they evince their habits; and in the attitude of terror, resistance and struggle that they bear, they tell the story of a sudden and violent death. There rises thus to the reading eye the picture of this ancient world, with its swarming tribes of life; now gambolling in the sunshine; now fleeing in terror before the tempest and the earthquake, and now lashing the waves into foam in the fury of their deadly and terrible contests. Other

fossils will tell him the story of a more advanced period in the earth's history. In the stomachs of the huge saurians that he finds, are yet preserved the undigested remains of the enormous reptile, the capture of which demanded that terrible combat, which in the end may have cost the victor his life, by a fit of saurian dyspepsia. In others he finds the remains of the very vegetables and trees whose enormous fossils are built into the coal measures, or deposited beside the unwieldy frame that once devoured them. As the geologist gazes on these stony pictures, there rise to his eye those ancient forests and marshes, with their towering tree ferns waving like queenly palms in the hot and mephitic atmosphere; reeds that stand like the mast of "some tall admiral;" and huge club-mosses shooting fifty feet in the air; while rolling their ponderous bulk in the tepid waters, or browsing lazily amid this gigantic herbage, are reptiles to which the crocodile of the Nile is but a whisking lizard, and forms of mylodon, megatherium and dinotherium, that seem but the horrid creations of the sick man's dream.

All this history, and much more, is written in these stony annals of the past; and yet generation after generation might quarry, and hew, and build these rocky registers, in utter ignorance of their wonderful contents. Hugh Miller, the mason, might have used these rocks as building stone just as well, if Hugh Miller, the geologist, had never discovered them to be the archives where God had deposited the history of a world.

Now precisely the same state of facts exists in regard to the words that we use in daily life. They have been formed in the remote past. They have lived in other elements of thought, and served other uses of action than the present. They have mingled with the changes of human history, and contain imbedded in their structure a record of these changes, which a careful inspection will enable us to trace with great distinctness. Words are in truth the fossils of history; embalming in their very structure the record of facts that have found no other memorials. Their value in this respect has only been fully known in our own day, that has given birth to the science of comparative philology. This science, by comparing the various languages of the earth, is detecting facts of history and ethnology that have found no other record. It is yet in its infancy; but the results already reaped give promise of a rich harvest when more abundant materials for its use shall have been collected.

It is not our purpose to attempt a sketch of this young science, nor is it needful for our present design. They who are ignorant of all languages but their own may find much to interest and instruct

in studying that, even though they never venture into the tangled thicket of comparative philology. Indeed, it has been well said that "the discovery that words are living powers has been to many a man like the dropping of scales from his eyes; like the acquiring of another sense, or the introduction to a new world."

Our object is rather to induce those who have turned but little attention to this subject, to devote more careful study to it, by giving some insight into the treasures contained in words. Could we be assured that Trench's little volume on "the Study of Words" was known generally to our readers we should deem a further prosecution of this subject comparatively needless, for some of our best illustrations have been taken from its pages. But as the study of words has usually been esteemed a very dry topic, this most entertaining and instructive volume has probably been but little read by the masses; while the Diversities of Purley is a book of which even literary men often know but little beyond the title. It is our purpose to endeavour to show that dry as this subject seems generally, it may, like the dry carcass of the lion that Samson slew, contain a hidden treasure of sweetness; that very valuable uses may be made of words beyond their use in speaking and writing; and for these ends, to select from any source facts suitable for our purpose without giving in each case a formal acknowledgment of the author or the book. If the profound philologist shall consider some of our illustrations common-place, and some of our etymologies questionable, we hope that he will remember that the commonest things are those that most men overlook; and that there exists the widest room for difference of opinion as to the etymologies of words, and that even a doubtful etymology may illustrate a true principle.

To give a notion of the subject in hand, let us select a simple illustration. Take, for example, an every-day transaction, the dating and signing of a letter. The words "dating," "signing," and "letter," have wrapped up in them certain historical facts. We have derived the word "date" from the Roman custom of inscribing a letter as "*datum*," "given" on a certain day; though the custom has been long laid aside; the word "signing," from the ancient use of the signet-ring, and the later custom of our illiterate ancestors in making the sign of the cross in place of their names, which they were unable to write; and the word "letter," from the Latin *litera*, which again is from *lino*, in allusion to the use of waxen tablets in writing. All these words indicate our connexion with old Rome, through a rude and uncultivated ancestry. But the same fact is yet further embodied in the date. The amazing power of Rome in impressing her practical organizations on the world, and her mission

thus in human history, is seen in the fact that we adopt her calendar, deriving the very word from the kalends, or calling days, in which the augurs proclaimed kalenda, or called out the beginning of another month. The name of the month that we write is Roman, and embodies some fact in Roman life, either the name of a god. like the months of Janus, (January,) Mars, (March,) Maia, (May,) or Juno, (June;) or a religious ceremony, like February, from *februo*, to lustrate or purify; or a climatic fact, like April, that records the opening (*aperio*) of the leaves; or the two great Cæsars, Julius and Augustus; or the fact that the old Romulian year began in March and consisted of but ten months, in the numerical designation of the four closing months of the year. The names of the days of the week also carry us back to Rome, but indicate that we have received this notation through a Teutonic ancestry, where the *dies solis* became Sun-day; *dies lunæ*, Mo(o)n-day; *dies Martis*, Tuisco's-day; *dies Mercurii*, Woden's-day; *dies Jovis*, Thor's-day; *dies Veneris*, Freia's-day; and *dies Saturni*, Saturn's-day. And it may be a betrayal of the ignorance of our fathers, that while the Roman arrangement was astronomical, or rather astrological, the Teutonic nomenclature was adopted as if it was purely mythological, and governed by the names of the Scandinavian divinities. In the date of the year we record that awful fact in the world's history, that God was made manifest in flesh, and dwelt incarnate on earth. And in most cases, the name of the place where we date from has some historic relations, and will connect us with some person or place of the past, either in the old world, or the new, that determined the adoption of this name. It will thus be seen that as we look into the most familiar words, we find fossilized facts, one within another, each carrying us further back toward the remote and unrecorded past.

There is much curious history, doubtless, wrapped up in names, now irrecoverably lost. The very fact that surnames become necessary embodies an historical fact. A *sur*-name or *super*-name, is simply an added name, and implies the arising of reasons for this addition. In feudal times, a single name only was necessary, as is practically the case now among the slaves of the South, because the legal relations of the serf did not demand any more specific designation. As the feudal system began to disintegrate, and the enlarged intercourse of the people united with their enlarged rights to give importance to particular persons, it became necessary to adopt some expedient to distinguish between different individuals. Among the Romans, we find a system, which, like everything else about that wonderful people indicates that tendency to compact

organization that was so striking a feature in their national life. The Roman citizen had three names, the first, or *prænomen*, indicating the individual, the second, or *nomen*, the *gens* or clan, and the third, or *cognomen*, the family. Thus in Marcus Tullius Cicero, Marcus is the individual name, Tullius indicates his descent from the Tullian *gens* or clan, and Cicero, the particular family of that gens from which he descended. Such a methodical nomenclature obviously indicates an advanced state of civil and political life. But it is otherwise with our surnames. They indicate no settled conditions of life, no definite relations of families; but a state of transition in which mere accident determined the choice of the name. The simplest and perhaps earliest designations would be those of relation. Thus from the sons of Robert, John, William, &c., we have Robertsons, Johnsons, Williamsons, Jamisons, Thomsons, Dicksons, Wilsons, Harrisons and others. The same fact was expressed by the Highlanders in the prefix *Mac;* by the Normans in the word *Fitz*, (which is only a corruption of *filius*, son;) by the Welsh *Ap;* the Russian suffix *witz;* the Polish *sky;* and the Spanish *ez;* while the Irish extended the nomenclature to the relation of grandson by their O, or Oy. The next step would naturally be the expression of remoter relations; and the kinsfolk of Tom, John, or Jean, Wat, &c., became the Tomkinses, Jenkinses, and Watkinses, although in some cases the suffix *kin* may have been a diminutive, like lambkin. There are some curious facts connected with the name John. Its derivatives are very numerous, both as to the number of persons bearing the name, and the number of names. We have the boundless family of the Joneses, and the kindred names of Johns, Jack, Jenks, Johnsons in all its spellings, Jackson, Hanson, Jenkins, Jennings, Jenkinson, &c., indicating a prodigious number of Johns, or rather that the name of John was a sort of generic name in early times; just as we now know all sailors by the name Jack. The same fact is indicated by its use in so many combinations that express contempt. Thus we have jackanapes, jack-pudding, jack-straws, jack-o'-lanterns, jack-sauce, jack-ass, boot-jack, jack-daw, jack-knife, kitchen-jack, &c., &c.; while from the Italian form of Gianni, we have Zani, or Zany, a mountebank, and the Spaniards have their Bobo Juan, or foolish John; and the French their Jean Potage. All these facts indicate a generic use of John, or Jack, in feudal times, somewhat like that which a modern satirist has almost succeeded in giving to the appellation Jeames.

After the numerous Christian names had been exhausted, then would come the trades, from which we have the Bakers, Barkers, (Tanners,) Butchers, Carters, Coopers, Carpenters, Glovers, Fowl-

ers, Harpers, Sawyers, Smiths, Shoemakers, Porters, Taylors and Waggoners. The immense family of the Smiths is accounted for by the fact, that the word smith (from the Saxon *smitan*, to smite,) meant originally any workman who smote or struck with his tools, whether he worked in wood, metal, or stone, and therefore included several trades now designated by other names. The residence of the family furnished the Hills, Fields, Bridges, Streets, Lanes, Woods and Houses. The offices of the parent, in church or state, furnished the Deans, Parsons, Marshalls, Constables, Sergeants, &c. The colours are represented by the Blacks, Whites, Grays, Browns, Greens, and Tawneys. Personal characteristics are perpetuated in the Sweets, Littles, Longs, Longfellows, Longmans, Smalls, Strongs, Swifts, Speeds, Lightfoots, Brights, Blunts and Broadheads. Sometimes the same name comes to us in several languages. We have in this country the families of three brothers, who in Germany were all called Klein, but who emigrating at different times, and two of them without the knowledge of the other, thinking it necessary to translate their names, have given us the three families of Kleins, Littles and Smalls. The various objects of nature, positions of the body, cries, sports, vessels, tools, weather, and, indeed, the sheerest accident would seem to have given us many of our surnames. Facts are embodied that one would scarcely wish to perpetuate. It is bad enough to have a cramp, or an aching-side for a few hours, without embalming them in such names as Cramp, Akenside, Ague-cheek, &c.; and other facts perpetuated are still more inexplicable, as we read such names as Drinkwater, Gotobed, Twelvetrees, Dolittle, Pop-kiss, Shakelady and Clapsaddle. But this endless confusion of surnames evinces a breaking up of social institutions, and an absence of any settled state of affairs, such as we see in the exact method adopted in the bestowal of proper names among the Romans. They are a deposit of conglomerate and diluvium, indicating a turbid and disquieted condition of the waters during their formation.

The geographical names of a country always embody much of its history. The names of many of our states, such as New-York, Pennsylvania, Delaware, Maryland, and the two Carolinas perpetuate the historical facts of their settlement. A full gazetteer would enable the careful student to detect many facts in our history. The most obvious fact that would present itself would be the various European names occurring in our new settlements. From these we should infer that the country was settled by a mixed population from all parts of Europe, who perpetuated the fatherland names in the land of their adoption. To some extent he would be able to trace the various streams of emigration, by the deposit of names

that they have left behind. In the English names of lower Virginia, we would find traces of the cavalier settlement; in the Antrims, Derrys and Donegals, he would detect the Scotch-Irish streams; in the New-Rochelles and New-Bordeaux, he would see the Hugonot trace; in the Amsterdams, Haarlems and Katskills the Dutch infusion; in the St. Marys, St. Louises, St. Augustines, St. Pauls, &c., he would discover the old Roman Catholic element from France and Spain; while in the Jerusalems, Jericho, Goshens and Bethlehems, he would suspect the presence of the men who rejoiced in such patronymics as Resist-the-devil Jones, Fight-the-good-fight-of-faith White, and who have not yet renounced such Hebrew appellations as Shearjashub, Adoniram, and Abimelech. That the people of this country had a high regard for liberty would be indicated by the countless towns named Freedom, Freeport, Freetown, Independence, Liberty and Union. That the present inhabitants of the country were only a secondary deposit, and not the primary occupants of the soil would be indicated by the fact that while the towns and political divisions have European and English names, the great natural features of the country, that existed before this stratum of emigration had been poured over it, the mountains, rivers, lakes and bays, have such names as Alleghany, Kittatinny, Tuscarora, Appomatox, Alabama, Ohio, Mississippi and Chesapeake. The various epochs of our national history will also be found marked by strata of names, as clearly as the successive deposits of fossils mark the great epochs of geology. The Revolution, the Indian wars, the war of 1812 and the Mexican war, and the great civil epochs, have deposited on our gazetteers the leading men and facts of their history, in such names as Washington, Jefferson, Jackson, Taylor, Clay, Lexington, Tippecanoe, Chippewa, Monterey, and Ashland; so that a careful chronological arrangement of the names would readily reconstruct a great part of the history that is thus monumentally perpetuated.

This record of national history and character appears also in the words and phrases in common use. It is. true that many of the phrases termed Americanisms are only imported Anglicisms; and it is also true that the English language is spoken in more purity in the United States than it is anywhere in the world, except by the highly educated classes of Great Britain. This fact is not accidental; but grows out of peculiarities in our national life. The different shires of England were at one time so much separated socially that dialects grew up, which were almost as distinct as different languages, and since this social separation has been diminished, there has not been such a general enjoyment of the various agencies

of popular instruction, such as the common-school, the newspaper, and the printed volume as to obliterate these distinctions. In this country, however, the original conglomerate of the population, their restless and changing character, the constant intermingling of the residents of all sections, and the universal diffusion of the school, the newspaper, and the printed book, have made the formation of such provincialisms as the Yorkshire, Derbyshire and Wilkshire dialects in England utterly impossible. Now, as the geologist infers a still and isolated condition of the waters when he finds separate deposits lying side by side in the same field, and a disturbed condition when he finds a wide-spread mass of conglomerate; so the student of language may perceive in the absence of provincial dialects in the United States, and their existence in England, indications of the different social and political conditions of the two countries, in their more general features.

But there is another class of facts that may be found in our language. As the geologist will find traces of the various streams that have contributed to deposit a mass of diluvium in the pebbles and drift which he discovers brought from distant sources, so the linguist may find in the words in common use traces of the various streams of life that have mingled in our national history. He sees the Indian current in such words as "hominy, canoe, barbacue, and moccasin;" the ancient French and Spanish and the modern Mexican dash, in the words "calaboose, bayou, levee, crevasse, pistareen, chapparel, cavortin, vamose and fandango." There are other words and phrases that betray clearly the peculiar condition of the country in which they arose. The roving character of the population, the absence of all ceremony in intercourse, and the frequent meeting of those who are unknown to each other, is indicated by the fact that while the Frenchman will courteously say "*Mon-sieur*," (my sir, or my lord,) the Englishman, more curtly, "sir," the German, more kindly, "neighbour," and the Quaker "friend," the Western man will say, "stranger," showing thus that those who meet are generally strangers, and that this fact does not debar intercourse. The great physical features of the country have given birth to such words as "backwoods, bottoms, canebrakes, clearing, deadening, digging, dug-out, corn-shucking, stump-speaking and log-rolling," and the political features of the country have given other secondary meanings to some of them that are by no means flattering to our legislative customs. The traces of our wild, frontier life of the dog, the gun, the temporary hut, and the perils of the forests, are seen in such vulgarisms as "to flash in the pan, to fix his flint, to bark up the wrong tree, to pull up stakes, to flat

[illegible]

[illegible]

out, to be a caution, and to be among the missing." The same thing appears in the fact that what the Englishman would call "game," and put in "a preserve" to keep it for sport, owing to their comparative scarcity, the American calls "varmints," because their number and annoyance are such as to lead him to desire their destruction as a huge sort of vermin. The rioting intensity of life that rushes through our veins is shown by our fondness for such epithets as "awful, powerful, dreadful, monstrous, almighty, and all-fired." There is a rude vigour of vitality embodied even in such outrageous syllabic combinations as "absquatulate, rantankerous and catawampous;" and our whole American life is condensed into the characteristic phrase, "go ahead." There are other words and phrases, which, though local in their origin, yet by their general adoption indicate facts in our condition, not always of the most complimentary character. Among these are such as "gerrymandering, talking to Buncombe, lobbying and pipe-laying;" such appellations as "Barn-burners, old Hunkers, Hards, Softs, Silver Grays, Woolly Heads, Loco Focos and Bucktails;" and such phrases as "give us your corn-stealer," "give him Jessy," "acknowledge the corn," and "see the elephant." The cautious and inquisitive character of the New-Englander is seen in his saying, "I guess," when others would say, "I think, or believe, or suppose," and his exclamation of surprise, "du tell!" instead of the usual interjections. His social relations are indicated by the word "helps" where an Englishman would says "servants;" the predominance of the religious element in his life by the phrase "true as preachin'," when the rough Western man would say, "true as steel;" and the restraints of his religious training are curiously exhibited in his employing such gingerly anathemas as "darn you, tarnation, goshens, golly," &c., in those times of mental excitement, when the more unscrupulous profanity of West and Southwest would, in their own phrase, "pile on the agony." The same sectional characteristics may be seen even in peculiarities of pronunciation. The genuine Jonathan will drawl out in the most cautious manner, as if unwilling to commit his organs too much, his "keouw, dang, eend, waal," while the semi-centaur of the Southwest will blunt out in headlong haste his "whar, thar, bar, yaller, &c.," with the most reckless outspurt of utterance; and the Southerner, who is in the habit of speaking to those who do not care to hear or to remember, betrays it in his constant "d'ye hear?" when addressing a servant, and his use of such words as "tote, gwine, nary-one," and his constant disuse of the *r* in pronunciation. Thus, without the formation of dialects such as we find in England, whenever there is a real difference of character or social condition

in different parts of the country, these differences will record themselves in differences of language. We can thus see the process going on before our eyes in which the facts of our national life are slowly crystallizing into verbal forms; and just as the geologist can reproduce much of the condition of a past epoch of the earth from the study of its fossils, so the philologist can reconstruct from our forms of speech very much of our national character and history.

But as these causes act slowly, and require time for their complete development, we must go further back in the history of our language for the treasures that are deposited in its words. We therefore propose to take an excursion among the hills, and look at the out-croppings of the strata.

The first fact that strikes us in looking at the English language is, that the primary element, the underlying granite on which all the rest reposes, is Saxon. Of the nearly forty thousand words that compose our language, about five-eighths are of Saxon origin, and they by far the most important portion for the common uses of speech. Added to this primary formation, we have successive strata of Gothic, Celtic, Latin, Norman-French, Greek and other more recent deposits. The curious fact that meets us here is, that the Anglo-Saxon constitutes the basis of the language, and not the Celtic, which was the speech of the original inhabitants of England. This brings to light the historical fact that the conquest of the Angles, Saxons and Jutes, from which arose the Saxon Heptarchy, was, like that of the Indians in this country, almost an extermination of the aboriginal inhabitants. The old Celtic occupants were driven to the mountains of Wales, the highlands of Scotland, and the islands of Ireland and the Isle of Man, where we still find their memorial in the Cambrian dialect of the first, the Erse or Gaelic of the second and third, and the Manx of the fourth place of their refuge. The only Celtic words of ancient date are the names of mountains, rivers, &c., which remain in England like the Indian names of this country, the monuments of a race that was wholly swept from their original habitation.

But we have embodied in our language not only the relation of conquerors to the conquered, but also their relations to one another. The fact that the language became Anglo-Saxon perpetuates the facts that there were four kingdoms of Angles, three of Saxons, and one of Jutes, previous to the consolidation of the heptarchy. The Saxon element was infused not solely because of any political predominance, but because the literary tastes of Alfred led to the cultivation of the West Saxon, which then by the translations of books from other languages, and by original writings, became the immova-

ble basis of the English speech; a basis so deeply rooted that no subsequent conquest could remove it. The predominance of the Angles just mentioned is further shown by the name of the island and language of England. When the country ceased to be called Brittania, on the total routing of the Celts, it became not Saxon-land, or Jut-land, but Angle-land, or England. It is a curious fact, illustrating the secondary growth of this name, and its adoption subsequent to the banishment of the Celts, that their descendants to this day in Wales and the Highlands of Scotland call the English not Angles or English, but Saxons, the name that their exiled forefathers carried with them and embalmed in their hatred and curse. The matured strength of this Anglo-Saxon civilization appears from the fact that its terms of political division have remained to the present day. We have political and municipal divisions in this country that we call Essex, Sussex, Norfolk, Suffolk, &c., without reflecting that we thus perpetuate the old Saxon boundaries, in which the East-Saxons were called Essex, South-Saxons Sussex, North-folk, Norfolk, South-folk, Suffolk, &c., through the various portions of the Saxon, or Anglian kingdoms. The strength of the political life contained in these forms is proved by the permanence of the terms created by it; just as the perfection of a fossilized skeleton or shell usually proves the original hardness and firmness of the osseous structure of the living animal.

The nature of the Norman conquest, and its difference from the Saxon, is also embodied in the language. That, unlike it, it was not an extermination, is shown by the fact that the name and language of the island remain. England did not become Normandy, as Brittania had become England, and the Norman-French did not supplant the Anglo-Saxon, as it had supplanted the Celtic. This proves that it was only a conquest, and not an extermination. But we have still deeper glances into the relative condition of the two parties from the language; that the Saxons, in spite of their political and literary culture were in a rude social condition appears from the fact that they had so few words to express any of the luxuries or elegancies of life, and therefore but few of the things represented by the words. We find a number of names for small rude houses, such as "hut, hovel, cot, cottage," &c., showing that these were the dwellings most familiar to them. The fact that names for more elegant houses, such as "castle, mansion, palace, hall," &c., are foreign words, shows that the things thus expressed came in with these foreigners. That the Norman was the conquering race we learn from the fact that the terms of honour and office are Norman, such as sovereign, sceptre, realm, royalty, throne, prince, duke and

count. There is one remarkable exception to this. The word king, (*könig*, or *kaning*, the man who *can*, who has might) is Saxon. This records the fact that the conqueror came in not as an unauthorized usurper, but on the plea that he was the rightful heir to the throne, the lawful king. All the inferior names of official authority, however, were changed. The Saxon "shire," which was once the portion of land shired, sheared, or cut off by the king when he created an earl, became "a county," or the portion assigned to a count. That the Norman flourished and fattened on the Saxon's toil, is shown by the fact that while the names of articles of luxury, terms of the chase and chivalry, are Norman, the names of implements of toil, such as spade, plough, flail, sickle, &c., are Saxon; as are also those of the great objects of nature, sun, moon, stars, earth, water, &c.; and the relations of life, such as father, mother, wife, and son. This fact has not escaped the keen eye of the author of Ivanhoe, who makes poor Wamba the witless for the nonce a philologist, as he points out the fact to the swineherd, that when the swine, ox, and calf were alive and needed attention they were called by Saxon names, but when killed and ready to be eaten they became pork, beef and veal, Norman appellations. To these he might have added that the Saxon sheep, deer, and fowl, became the Norman mutton, venison and pullet, showing that the poor Saxon ceased to have anything to do with them as soon as they were prepared for the table.

That the sturdy Saxon was refractory under his yoke, and required severe measures to keep him from plotting rebellion, is indicated by the word "curfew." This is from the Norman-French *couvre-feu*, (cover the fire;) because William the Conqueror required the Saxons to cover their fires and extinguish their lights when the curfew bell rang, in order that there might be no nightly plottings of revolt. The warlike character of these early times is strikingly indicated by other words. In modern times there is no necessary disgrace attached to a surrender as a prisoner of war, nor is it a necessary stigma of cowardice. But that it was otherwise with our fierce forefathers is shown by the words caitiff and craven; one of which meant only a captive, and the other one who asked or craved his life from an enemy. That these acts became marks of disgrace proves the ferocious spirit with which war was waged in these sanguinary times. The word "poltroon" also indicates the same fact. A poltroon was a *pollice truncus*, one who had cut off his thumb so that he could not draw the bow, and thus might evade military conscription.

It will be seen by these few illustrations how the main facts in

the two early epochs of English history, the Saxon and Norman conquests, have recorded themselves in our language; so that a future historian might reconstruct much of the early history of England, just as Niebuhr has that of Rome, from these fossilized preservations of the events of the past.

Nor has the Danish irruption left no traces behind. It is marked as clearly as a coal deposit by the names that it gave to the towns that were then occupied. The Danish termination "by," meaning "town" will be found in such names as Wetherby, Derby, Whitby, &c., marking with great exactness the limits of the Danish settlements in England.

There is another great historical epoch not far distant from these events, that has also left some impress on our language. We refer to the Crusades. From them we have the word "palmer," the mendicant pilgrim who brought back his palm staff as a proof of his visit to the Holy Land. The character of these pilgrims, or perhaps rather of those who pretended to be pilgrims, is curiously recorded in the word "saunter." A saunterer was originally one who went on a pilgrimage to the Holy Land, *à la sainte terre.* These pilgrims were gladly entertained by those to whose hospitality they appealed. But in process of time the pilgrimages attracted the lazy louts who were too indolent to work, and the cunning impostors who sponged on the hospitality of strangers under the pretext that they were pilgrims *à la sainte terre,* and who wandered from place to place on this plea, so that finally to profess to be a holy-lander, or saunterer, became synonymous with being a loitering, idle fellow. Our word "loafer" has had probably a similar origin, from the German *laufen,* to run or wander from place to place; although it is true that in our country the loafer rarely runs except at the sight of a police officer.

We have also probably a trace of these times in our word "miscreant." This means literally an unbeliever, and was applied in this sense originally to the Turks. But as they were regarded with intense hatred by the Christians, this hatred at last intensified the word to the meaning it now has of a man whose works are as bad as his faith; and thus records the unconscious judgment of the human race that wrong thinking will soon develop into wrong doing. The word "assassin" was also introduced about this time. It was originally the name of a tribe of fanatics in Persia, who, like the Thugs of India, murdered as a matter of religious duty all that were devoted to death by their prince, the Old Man of the mountains. These wretches were extirpated about this time, and their name was transferred to our language as a memorial of their bloody fanaticism; thus recording their history just as the word "burking" records one

of the monstrous forms of murder in modern times. The designation of all Europeans by the name Franks, in Mohammedan countries, had its rise at this time. The French being the most prominent in these wild forays, gave their name to all Europeans, just as the restless, roaming character of the New-Englanders has given to all Americans the sobriquet of Yankees. Indeed, the word Frank embodies an historical fact that carries us yet further back. The early tribe of Germans that received this name possessed a manly independence, and an open candour which contrasted so strikingly with the crafty Gauls and the degenerate Romans that their name became the designation of this type of character, just as the adjective in the phrase "a Yankee trick" describes a species of adroitness that is by no means monopolized by the descendants of the Pilgrims.

This kind of record may also be seen in the word "chouse." This comes from the Turkish *chiaous*, a messenger, and had its entree into our language in this wise. In 1609 a messenger or *chiaous* of the Grand Seigneur cheated the Turkish and Persian merchants in England out of about $20,000, a large sum at that time. From the notoriety of the fact, to perform the same game was called to chouse; and thus, like a fly in amber, this rascally Turk has been handed down to posterity. Some of the financial transactions of our own country are in danger of adding some specimens of this doubtful species of riches to our language.

A curious exchange of meanings has occurred in the words "barter" and "cheat." Barter once meant to cheat, from *barrater*, to cheat; a meaning that is still seen in the legal term barratry. Cheat on the contrary is simply a contracted form of *escheat*, a forfeiture to the crown or government; and had originally no intimation of dishonesty connected with it. But as the escheator who attended to these forfeitures was not very scrupulous in his proceedings, escheating in the legal sense became cheating in the illegal sense, and thus passed into the language of common life to carry down to other generations the practices of these officers of the law. The merchants may hence twit the lawyers with the fact that the mercantile term passed from a roguish meaning to an honest one, while the legal term took the opposite track; though the lawyers may probably claim some of the credit of this change by their success in detecting roguery, and may perhaps be in possession of facts, professionally, that would show that bartering has not yet lost its original and less creditable signification.

There is a curious piece of medieval history embodied in the word "dunce." John Duns Scotus was one of the acutest men of

the middle ages, and the leader of the metaphysical party in the Church of Rome. His logical and theological writings became thus a text-book for his disciples for many years after his death. At the revival of letters, the scholars of the new era began to quote Greek and Hebrew, which the Scotists rejected as an innovation, clinging to the syllogisms of their great master, and quoting his sentences as sufficient authority. Hence, as Tyndal has noted, the Duns disciples became the violent opponents of learning, so that a Duns-ist, or Dunse, became the name of contempt for an ignorant booby. Thus by a peculiarly hard fate, poor John Duns Scotus, the most subtle intellect of his age, is perpetuated to posterity in that juvenile martyr to literary pursuits in the village schools, whose melancholy visage is surmounted by the dunce-cap.

The word melancholy suggests to us another kind of history that is contained in words. It is the history of opinions. Old Burton in his Anatomy of Melancholy remarks, "The name melancholy is imposed from the matter and disease denominated, from the material cause, as Bruel observes, *melancholia*, as if *μέλαινα χολή*, from black choler. Frascatorius, in his second book of Intellect, calls those melancholy whom abundance of that same depraved humour of black choler hath so misaffected, that they became mad thence, and dote in most things or in all belonging to election, will, or other manifest operations of the understanding." We have, then, in this word a record of the old system of humoral pathology. This system taught that there were four humours or moistures in the body, namely, blood, phlegm, choler, and melancholy or black bile; and according to the mixture of these humours was the temperament of the man, both bodily and spiritual. When the blood predominated it made a sanguine, hopeful man; when the choler, which was supposed to contain the principle of natural heat, it made a choleric, fiery, irritable man; when the phlegm, it made a cold, dull, phlegmatic man; when the melancholy, or black bile, it made a gloomy, desponding, melancholy man. We retain these terms in common use, though the pathology which gave them their significance has long since been exploded and almost forgotten. This same physiological theory, also, has bequeathed to us other words still in use. It taught that a man's disposition depended on the right mixture of these humours; and hence we speak of a humorous man, a man's humour, a good humoured or bad humoured person; and, also, of a good temper, a bad temper, a distemper, a temperament of body, &c., all of which terms had their origin in the theory that the disposition of a man depended on the tempering of these primary humours of the body.

Another set of terms that still continue in use are those of astrology. We have long since ceased to believe in sidereal influences on the lives of men, and yet we retain the word "influence," which originally referred to the flowing down (*influens*) of a force or virtue from the planets upon the earth. The word "ascendent" is from the same terminology. We also speak of a "disaster," from *dis* against, and *aster* a star, which originally meant that a man's star was malignant or against him. We still speak of a man as a "jovial," although we do not think that it is owing to his being born under the influence of the planet Jupiter or Jove, the roystering chief of the Pagan Olympus; and we use the terms "saturnine," and "mercurial," though we do not think that gloomy Saturn, or light-heeled and light-fingered Mercury have anything to do with the matter whatever.

The ancient tendency of the human mind to refer its acts and states to superhuman and sub-human influences, what Comte calls the theological phase, is also embodied in words. A "guilty" man was at first a guiled or guilt man, that is, one guiled by the devil. So a "wicked" man was a man witched, from *wiccan*, to bewitch. We retain these terms though we fasten the responsibility nearer home than either the devil or the witch. We also speak of a person as fascinating, without having any faith in the power of killing with the evil eye, as the word *fascino* originally meant; and talk of another as "enchanting," although we know that the day of enchantments, or wizardly incantations, is over; and call others "bewitching" without the slighest intention of intimating that they perform nocturnal journeys on a broomstick. The word journey we may remark in passing, also records a state of facts that antedates our age of railroads, and even coaches, that have night lines as well as day. It meant, originally, a day's travel, (*jour*, a day,) and hence we have the words journey-man, journey-work, which were originally applied to men who worked by the day, and work that was performed by the day. Hence a nocturnal journey is etymologically a contradiction.

We have, also, in a number of words records of particular notions that have long since been laid aside or forgotten. In the phrase "sardonic laugh," we record the ancient opinion of the Greeks that there was an herb in Sardinia that would make those who ate it die with laughter. In the word "sarcophagus," which is literally flesh-eater, and which seems to be an unaccountable name for a receptacle designed to preserve and not to destroy the bodies of the dead, we perpetuate the opinion of the ancients that the stones of Assos in Troas, from which tombs were made, would in forty days

consume the bodies that were placed in them, all but the teeth, as Pliny informs us, and hence were called sarcophagi, or flesh-consumers. In the word "panic," we retain the notion of the Greeks that the god Pan had some finger in the mischief thus designated. In the phrase "hermetically sealed," we transmit the notion that Hermes Trismegistus was the author of the chemical art: in the word "electricity," that amber (*electron*) was the substance in which electric phenomena were supposed solely to reside, because first noticed in it. We also speak of the "halcyon days" of human life; and are somewhat puzzled to learn that the halcyon is the king-fisher, until we find out that the seven days before and after the winter solstice were so named: because then this bird made its nest among the reeds by the seashore, inasmuch as during these days the sea was usually calm and the sky bright. We speak of the "nightmare," also, without believing that the old Runic spectre Mara seizes and throttles us during the night. We also continue to call a metallic medicine "antimony," although we do not believe that it has any special antipathy to monks, as its discoverer did, who gave it to an unsuspecting monk by way of experiment, and killed the poor fellow; and hence called it antimony, or anti-monk, in view of its supposed anti-popery properties. Thus we find by chipping off the outer shell of many of our words, we have embodied a record of the crude opinions of our predecessors on many subjects.

But we have not only records of crude opinions in words, but also of the crude condition of the arts in ancient times. Most persons are aware that "paper" is so called from the Egyptian reed *papyrus*, the early writing material; and that "volume" (something rolled) is derived from the rolling of MSS. before the discovery of the arts of printing and book-binding. But we have other words that embody records of similar facts. In the word library (from *liber*, bark) we have the fact that men once used the smooth bark of trees to write on: a fact also preserved in the word "book," which is the old Anglo-Saxon for a beach-tree, because its polished bark was used in this way. In the word "style" we preserve the name of the Roman *stylus*, the iron pen, one end of which traced the lines on the waxen tablet, and the other erased them when the writer made his corrections. The word "pen" is undergoing this change in our own day. It is literally a *penna*, a feather or quill, though now we speak of a quill pen and a steel pen. We also speak of "calculating," although we no longer use *calculi*, or pebbles, to aid us in the process; and use the word "stipulation," though the custom of handing a *stipula* or straw from the seller to the buyer of a

piece of land, in attestation of the contract, is no longer used. We count by "scores," meaning twenties, although we have more convenient methods of reckoning than our ancestors, who counted by notches, and when they had reached twenty, scored; that is, cut off the tally, from the old verb *scuran*, to cut off. The laying aside of this method of reckoning was adduced by Jack Cade as one of the misdemeanors of the Lord Say in Henry VI.: "Thou hast most traitorously corrupted the youth of this realm, in erecting a grammar school; and whereas before, our forefathers had no other books but the score and tally, thou hast caused printing to be used; and contrary to the king, his crown, and dignity, thou hast built a paper-mill." So we use the phrases "signing our name," "signature," &c., notwithstanding we no longer make the sign of the cross, as our unlettered fathers did; when, unable to write their names, they made a sign for them, or signed instead of writing them. And the tenacity of these ancient customs is indicated by the fact, that when a man is compelled to make his mark, we find him, Protestant though he be, making the sign of the cross, as duly as the devoutest Catholic; although in the very act he seems to confess to being a know-nothing.

There are also national and social customs that are embodied in words. Thus "candidate" is from *candida*, white, because a Roman aspirant to office always wore an unusually white toga; a custom that is perhaps perpetuated in modern times by the white-washing that is commonly given to these gentlemen by their friends. From the same source we have the word "ambition," which is literally a going about, (*ambitio*,) and was applied to that patriotic impulse that led men to desire to sacrifice themselves to the service of their country on the altars of one of her fat offices, and hence to go about soliciting votes; a sort of pilgrim's progress that our annual elections show has not yet become wholly obsolete. So a "clerk," at one stage of the changing history of its meaning, meant any one who could read, although now it means any one who can write; and when the phrase "benefit of clergy" was first introduced, clerks and clergy were the same class; although in our day the clerks would be very unwilling to be held to all the restraints that are imposed upon the clergy. A "husband" was so called because he was regarded as the "house-band," as old Tusser has it:

> "The name of a *husband*, what is it to say,
> Of wife and of *household* the band and the stay."

And yet in spite of old Tusser's authority we know that often the stay of the house comes from the other side. The "wife" was so

called from *weben* to weave, because among our simple Saxon ancestors, she did the weaving of the household; and the unmarried lady was called "spinster," because she did the spinning. We retain the terms wife and spinster, although these operations have long been laid aside, except in the insinuations of crabbed satirists, who are fond of charging modern spinsters with the manufacture of a less profitable kind of yarn, outside of the house, than that which is produced by the stationary spinning jennies. The word "bonnet" is derived from *bonad*, a covering; it being an antiquated prejudice that this article of dress was designed to cover the head; a blunder of our great-grandmothers that is exposed now in the most barefaced manner. The word "bead" comes from *beden*, to pray, and had its origin in the use of the rosary in praying, when one bead was dropped for every petition. In our day, however, wearing beads and saying prayers are things that have no necessary connexion. The word "gossip" has also wandered very far from its original meaning. It meant originally a sponsor for a child in baptism. These sponsors were supposed to acquire a spiritual relationship to the child that created a kinship with each other that made intermarriage unlawful. Hence, as the male sponsor was called the godfather, and the female the godmother, their relationship was called godsibb, or kin in God, using the old word sibb, which meant kindred. The christening days and birthdays naturally brought these spiritual relations together in a festive manner, and as Junius very ungallantly observes, they soon came together to tell stories and to tipple over them. Thus by an obvious process the word gossip acquired its present meaning; which involves a very different kind of sponsorship, ofttimes, than that which is assumed at the baptismal font. Thus it is that words remain as witnesses of facts long after those who acted in them have passed away; thus verifying in a remote sense the declaration of Scripture, "By thy words shalt thou be justified, and by thy words shalt thou be condemned."

A number of words carry in their structure the history of the places from which the articles described by them had their origin. Thus the damson, or damascene plum, tells us that it came from Damascus; while the cloth called "damask" tells the same story. The "bayonet" proclaims that it was made originally at Bayonne; "cambric," at Cambray; "dimity," at Damietta; "carpet," at Cairo, (*Cairo tapet*, or Cairo tapestry;) "muslin," or *mousseline*, that it came from Moussul; "calico," from Callicut; "gingham," from Guinchamp; "gauze," from Gaza; "arras," from Arras; "holland," from Holland, though now it comes mainly from Ireland;

"currants," from Corinth; "guinea," from Guinea gold; "camlet," from camel's hair; and "artesian wells," from Artois, where they were first made. The same process is going on at the present time in such things as Petersham coats, Mackinaw blankets, Lowell cottons, and other commercial articles, where the adjective is gradually absorbing to itself all the force of a name. The word "bedlam" had an original of this kind. It is simply a corruption of Bethlehem, the hospital of St. Mary, Bethlehem, having been given to the city of London, in 1545, as a receptacle for lunatics, whence a madhouse is called a bedlam. The word "tariff" has had a parentage that will rejoice the enemies of a protective system. It comes from Tarifa, the promontory that juts out from Spain into the Straits of Gibraltar, where the piratical Moors were in the habit of arresting all ships entering the Mediterranean, and compelling them to pay toll for the privilege. This levying of black-mail was called tariffing, from whence we have our word tariff; a derivation which the fiery free-trader will think to be a very appropriate one for what he regards as a system of legalized piracy.

But we must pause in our fossil hunting, not, however, for want of material, for we have left some of the richest veins of this great deposit untouched. There are mournful chapters of national history contained in the changes that have occurred in the meanings of words. What volumes of Roman history are contained in the word *virtus* every Latin scholar knows. It is a cameo-picture of Roman history for many centuries. But what a mournful proof of change is evinced by the fact that the people who tread on the ashes of Brutus and Cato, now mean by *vertu*, not the stern manliness of its old Roman original, but tit-bits of rarity, gimcracks and old curiosities, as if to possess these was the highest attainment of man. It is a further proof of Italian degeneracy that by a *virtuoso* they mean not a brave, or even a virtuous man, as the old Latin *virtuosus* meant, but a man skilled in the fine arts; by a *bravo*, not a hero, but a brigand or an assassin; and by a *cicerone*, not a Ciceronian in the choice and utterance of eloquent words, but the glib and gabbling showman who pilots strangers around the relics of their nobler ancestry. One is painfully reminded of those Dead Sea apes, of which Carlyle makes so much use in some of his writings. The French language has a number of such indications of national character. Such words as *perfide*, *roué*, *beau*, *belle*, *hotel*, *religieuse*, *chevalier d'industrie*, *fille de joie*, *poudre de succession*, and the whole vocabulary of mockery in which this language is so rich, give volumes of insight into the interior life of the people whose thoughts are either expressed or concealed by such words. Nor is

our English language wanting in such tokens of degeneracy. There are in English history as marked eras of degradation as Hugh Miller has ever discovered in the records of the old red sandstone. We have a number of words, that now convey a degrading sense, in the meaning of which there was once nothing at all derogatory. Thus *maudlin* is from *Magdalen*, a weeping penitent; *cant* from *chant*, or *canticle*, a solemn hymn to God; *prude* once meant only one who was *prudent; demure*, (from *des mœurs*,) one who was regardful of morals; *saint* and *godly* had no more lurking sarcasm than their synonymes, *holy* and *godlike; homely* once meant simply *homelike; gallantry* meant only a chivalrous bravery, and had no equivocal sense; *resentment*, even as late as the time of Bacon, was used in its primitive sense of reflection, from *re-sentire*, to think again, and had no anger involved in it whatever. A *rake* once meant only a reckless, and not necessarily a debauched person; a *varlet* was only a valet or hireling; a *villain*, only a *villanus*, a country labourer or servant; a *wench*, a young girl; an *imp* once meant only a descendant. So that Lord Cromwell, in writing to fierce old Henry VIII., could call his sainted son, Edward VI., in a phrase meant to be highly complimentary, "that goodlie imp;" a *libertine* once was only a liberal or free-thinker on religious subjects, and not one whose creed had crept into his life; *paraphernalia* was originally only a woman's dower, and had no sense of tawdry ornament; and the word *tawdry* itself only meant originally those ornamental things that were sold at the fair of St. Audrey. Thus it has been with many words, that once had a primeval innocence of meaning, but, like the race that used them, have had a fall. Many of them may be found changing about the time of the restoration of the Stuarts, recording thus the influx of corruption that came in with the witty and wicked Charles. Indeed, the very process of transition in some cases may be traced in the pages of Dryden, evincing the mournful degradation that was then occurring in the English character. In the reaction from Puritanism, honour, virtue, religion and purity were becoming mere mockeries; all belief in their very existence was dying out among the classes that gave currency to language, and hence by an obvious process the names of these qualities became terms of sneering contempt, and now stand as ghastly memorials of the degenerate days of the Restoration.

The mere absence of words in a language often indicates national character most strikingly, for it indicates the absence of the things expressed by those words. How significant a fact is it that only in our English tongue do we find that rich word *home*, a word so full of the music of household joys and fireside memories. What a

striking fact is it that most heathen languages, even so cultivated a one as the Chinese, have no word expressing the name of God; and yet one Australian tribe has a word to express a form of infanticide for which we have not coined a term; while another has four words to express as many different kinds of murder, none of which involve any moral disapprobation, and yet has not one word to express love. Nor is our own language without these ethical indications. What an argument for the Maine law may be found in the opulence of our vocabulary respecting the immoderate use of strong drink. Men speak in the most gingerly terms of a man as being "in liquor, the worse for liquor, shot in the neck, half seas over, a brick in the hat, how came you so, on a frolic, on a spree, disguised, inebriated, intoxicated, funny, joyful, muddled, jolly, corned, tight, boozy, slewed, fuddled, high, sweet, soaked, drunk," down to "dead drunk," and yet the remarkable fact is, that many of these terms are absolutely apologetic, and not one of them implies disapprobation, except the Latin derivative "intoxicated," from *toxicum*, poison. But on the other hand how discouraging are the prospects of the Maine law among a people that have more than two dozen terms to describe getting drunk, and only one to describe staying sober.

We have purposely left untouched some of the profoundest questions of history connected with the study of words. We refer to the ethnological aspects of philology. These are among the most absorbing questions of science in our day. As the geologist may trace the path of a boulder, or the drift of a diluvium back to the rocky bed from which they were originally torn, though leagues distant; so the comparative philologist is now tracing the relations of different languages, not only in the meaning of particular words, but also in their grammatical structure, and then reaching facts of primeval history that have no other record on earth. Nations as widely separated as the Ganges and the Rhine are thus found to have a common origin; and grammatical peculiarities that have puzzled the English, Latin and Greek scholar, are found to be explained by that old and sacred tongue in which the Hindoo religion and philosophy have been sealed up for so many centuries. Thus, like the sea-shell that murmurs to the ear of the chiming waves of the far-off ocean home of its earliest life, our western languages are found telling the story of their origin in that ancient homestead of the race, the beautiful valleys of Central Asia.

There are also rich ethical treasures found in words, containing as they do the profoundest moral judgments of the race, the more forcible because undesigned. How emphatic the testimony, to the tendency of all passions to make their possessor wretched, that is found

in the word *passion*, which originally meant suffering, a meaning which we still retain in speaking of "the passion of our Lord;" also, in the word *anger*, which has the same root with *anguish;* also, in calling a covetous man a *miser*, that is, a miserable man; and a *penurious* or *parsimonious* man, a man of *penury* or *scarceness*, (*parcitas*,) though he may possess great wealth. By many such words men have thus recorded their own condemnation.

Rich gems of poetry are also embedded in language, especially in the more impassioned languages of the East. How full of poetry is our word *fall*, that echoes with the rustling of the falling leaf, compared with *autumn*, which tells only of the *auctum*, the adding or increase then given to the fruits of the earth! How beautiful is the German *morgen-land*, (morning-land,) applied to the East; *fader-land*, (father-land,) to one's native country; and our *mother tongue*, as applied to the language that we learn from the lips of a mother. How full of poetry, also, is our word *cemetery*, literally sleeping-place, applied to the last resting places of the dead; a Christian thought that rises still higher in its range of poetic imagery in the beautiful Saxon name *God's acre*, by which was designated the hallowed spot where the dust of dear ones was laid in hope.

There is also music in words. Indeed, much of the melody of poetry is in the music that is contained in the words.

But all these and other topics must be omitted. Our object has been mainly to induce those whose attention has never been directed to these studies, to turn it thitherward, and to show how richly our noble English tongue has come down to us laden with the treasures of an undated past, and what glorious promise is thus given of its future. Indeed, the very composite character that has been often urged as one of its defects is one of the very attributes that seem to mark it as yet destined to be the universal language of the earth. It descends to us like some magnificent army of occupation, gleaming with the armour and banners of every race that has been mightiest on earth. Central in its solid columns do we see the stalwart forms of the Angle, and the Saxon, and the Jute, whose brawny muscles have gathered thew in the dark forests of the North. Glittering on one of its wings we see the nodding plumes and prancing steeds of the Norman Frank, as he links his fiery chivalry with the serried squadrons of the Anglo-Saxon; on the other we descry the stately maniples of Rome, the compact phalanxes of Greece, the stern and solemn tribes of the Hebrew, and the gorgeous array of the Orientals. All these mighty and magnificent elements we see moving in steady, calm, and unbroken march along the plains of Europe, the continent of America, and the colonial occupations of Asia, Africa,

and Australia, carrying, as we believe, by a more resistless might than that of armies and navies, Anglo-Saxon literature. Anglo-Saxon science, Anglo-Saxon civilization, and Anglo-Saxon religion to the destined conquest of the world.

Since writing these pages, we have seen another of Mr. Trench's admirable books, in which some of our previous remarks have been anticipated; but as our obligations to him have already been so great, we have not thought it needful to make any change in what is written, even at the risk of making those obligations seem greater than they really are.

ART. VI.—LIFE AND TIMES OF BISHOP HEDDING.

Life and Times of Rev. Elijah Hedding, D. D., late Senior Bishop of the Methodist Episcopal Church. By REV. D. W. CLARK, D. D. With an Introduction, by REV. BISHOP E. S. JANES. 1 vol., 8vo. New-York: Carlton & Phillips. 1855.

METHODIST denominational literature is especially rich in the department of biography. This results directly, and almost necessarily, from its genius, which is an individual life, tending powerfully to bring out the individual character. In this particular, as in many others, Methodism attests its identity with simple and unrestrained Christianity, which, to an eminent degree, addresses itself to the individual conscience, and manifests its saving and elevating power in the life and character of its subjects. By virtue of this peculiarity, our holy religion, whether called by its catholic or by some sectional name, has ever been a revolutionary power—destructive indeed toward venerable abuses, but potently reconstructive of whatever is valuable—and then equally conservative of what is thus produced. From the nature of the case the stores of this department of our literature must be steadily augmenting. The hidden power of the Gospel, operating in many hearts, is constantly producing its fruits, in the holy lives and virtuous deeds of its subjects. Such lives, and the noble actions that adorn them, ought not to perish with the fleeting breath of mortality. It is one of the high purposes of a sanctified literature to embalm the memory of the good, and thus to give to all ages of the Church the virtuous deeds and holy examples of the great and wise of other times.

We are not, however, of those who think that a biography of every good man should be written and published; simply because the thing

is impossible. There is a limit to the reading capabilities of the world, however the case may be as to the writing. There are more things intrinsically worthy to be remembered, than the minds of men can receive and retain. Some things, therefore, must be consigned to oblivion. It is quite possible that what is intrinsically worthy to be retained, may be also relatively unworthy, and therefore ought not to be remembered. Hence it is a real misfortune when misdirected genius sets the seal of indestructibleness upon inferior objects, and thereby excludes superior ones from the stores of literature. Only great men should be honoured with monuments—whether material or literary—for monuments are designed for posterity to study; and for this purpose only great examples should be used. The study of greatness embodied in character tends naturally to engender like qualities in the mind of the contemplator. Not so, however, with goodness, (so vitiated is human character,) unless it is adorned and rendered attractive by a coexistent greatness. It may therefore be questioned whether the memoirs of many pious persons of moderate intellects and narrow fields of action are not a real disservice to the cause of religion. Greatness, however, should in this estimate be measured by its true standard; and probably in not a few cases it would be found that real magnanimity exists where the glare of external splendour is wanting.

To write the biography of a recently deceased person is always a difficult and delicate task. Time, the great arbiter and the only reliable judge of what ought to be remembered or forgotten, has not yet made his decisions. The newly-gathered fruits are yet crude, nor can it be determined which will mellow into richness and which will decay in the process. It seems to be conceded that none but a friendly hand should compose such a work, and yet that very friendship must interfere with the cool and unprejudiced action of the writer. But when not only the individual, in his actions and character, is made the theme of the disquisition, but the whole field of his relations is contemplated, and the related things in their connexion with the subject of the memoir, the difficulty becomes greater in proportion to the greatness of the theme. Nearly all subjects of public interest have their partizan aspects, and upon any contemporary subject all who may be sufficiently interested to read a book relating to it, may be supposed to belong to one or other party. To discuss, to the satisfaction of all parties, the questions that must come under notice in such a work, is quite impossible. If the writer pursue only the truth, without fear or favour, even were he infallible in his determinations, he can satisfy only those with whom he may agree. If he compromise the existing differences—the favourite

method with some—he would probably offend all, and at the same time violate truth and right; for it is far from being the case that these always lie midway between extremes. Such are some of the difficulties to be encountered in such a work as is the volume named at the head of this paper. How well the writer has managed them will be seen only by a perusal of the volume itself; though we shall endeavour in this paper to aid our readers somewhat in the matter.

Our first reflection on taking the book in hand was, that it is too large. So we still think, had it been only a memoir of Bishop Hedding. But when its design, as indicated by its title, is seen to be to review and discuss the character and progress of American Methodism during the first half of the present century, the objection changes sides. Such a discussion at this time must necessarily be partial as well as crude; and though it could not be entirely avoided, yet it was neither needful nor desirable to attempt to exhaust the subject. As to the form of the work, the author had no election; its character compelled him to follow the order of time in the distribution of his matter: a very natural, but generally a very uninteresting method. Yet the succession of events in the history of the illustrious deceased, or the evolution of periods in the history of the Church, permitted some degree of distribution beyond that of mere annals. Probably, in this matter, all that the case allowed has been done.

As to the style of the work and its literary merits we must speak sparingly. The author is not unknown to the Methodist public as a writer of a good degree of celebrity, who is steadily adding to his well-earned reputation, both as author and editor, by successive contributions to our literature. He is yet in the prime of life, in the noonday of intellectual manhood; and we doubt not that should he be favoured with life and health, the world will hear from him again. Perhaps on account of the personal relations of the reviewer and the author, our commendations would be received rather as the results of personal favour than of calm, discriminating criticism; at any rate, we willingly leave this volume to speak for itself. No one, however, can deny his honest and open-handed dealing with the subjects that come under his hand: and while, *secundum artem*, to say nothing of higher motives, he is the steady friend and advocate of his honoured subject, he nevertheless deals fairly and kindly—often remarkably so—with those of the opposite party. He is unwavering in his attachments to Methodism, *as it is*, in all its essential features, yet not so blindly wedded to its accidents, as to be precluded from a fair and manly examination of any proposed improvements or

reforms. We may venture, however, to add, that we should not generally consider it a fortunate event, so far as his literary reputation is concerned, for any writer to be flattered by being selected for such a work. Valuable as we confess the work to be, and honourable to both the mind and heart of the writer, it is, nevertheless, of necessity wanting in many of the essential properties of a work of high literary merit. This remark, however, lies wholly and exclusively against the work, and not against the writer. The Realists tell us that the great Creator could only produce the imperfect world in which we live because of the perversity of the materials with which he wrought, and of the forms into which they were cast. A like consideration should be used in the case before us.

The life of Bishop Hedding presents a number of prominent points inviting our remarks. Several important questions of Church polity and administration are immediately connected with his history; and some of the most exciting events in our ecclesiastical annals for the last half century are brought fully before us in his personal biography. To some of these, as discussed in this volume, we purpose to direct attention; to examine the method in which they are here disposed of; and perhaps to rediscuss the principles involved, and "so far forth" settled. These things, together with some brief reference to matters more exclusively biographical, will make up the substance of this paper.

Elijah Hedding, late senior bishop of the Methodist Episcopal Church, was born in Dutchess county, New-York, June 7th, 1780. His ancestry, three generations back, was English, and the family was strongly marked with their national peculiarities. The state of society in that region of country was at that time, and had been from the beginning, strangely anomalous. The country on the banks of the Hudson, constituting the original Dutch province of New-Amsterdam, afterward New-York, was originally occupied by a mixed population from nearly all the countries of western Europe, and of every religious sect that then divided and distracted those countries. The eastern bank of the river, originally divided into the counties of Westchester, Dutchess, and Rensselaer, was chiefly occupied by an English population. The Dutch occupied a few towns near the river, but the whole interior was settled by persons speaking the English language. The course of settlement was usually left to the direction of accidents or individual caprice. The original settlers were generally very poor, uneducated, and exceedingly rude. Schools were long unknown, and few of the first generation reared in that region, knew anything of letters. The religious condition of the people was, for a hundred years after the

province fell into the hands of the English, or even to the close of the war of Independence, most deplorable. In the Dutch towns there were generally a minister and Church of the Reformed order, but, for the most part, very little of the form and less of the power of religion was found in them. The English Episcopal Church, though constituted by law the religion of the province, had but very few parishes in all this region. The Quakers had made several settlements, and though they of course brought with them their peculiar faith and modes of worship, yet from their non-aggressive habits, they exerted but little influence on any beyond themselves, and indeed their system has proved insufficient to sustain itself against external influences. A few Presbyterian churches scattered over the country, in remote parts, and in the portions bordering on Connecticut and Massachusetts a few of the Congregational order, and also a very few Baptists, though all of them commonly overcharged with high Calvinism, served to keep alive the flickering light of Christianity among a simple, but extremely rude population

It was of this heterogeneous race that our subject came. After the war of the Revolution great advancements had been made, and most of the young people of the better families had learned to read. The neighbourhood in which young Hedding was born and reared, bordered on a Quaker settlement and felt its influences. The people were generally irreligious, both in character and manners. Wide extents of country were wholly destitute of religious provisions. The Sabbath was a day of idleness, pleasure, and dissipation; and it was no infrequent thing for persons to have grown up to mature age without having ever heard a prayer or attended any religious exercises. Yet we should greatly err should we hastily conclude that true religious feeling and sentiment was unknown among them. Man is naturally a religious being, and where the light of revelation is not wholly wanting, his soul will often respond in secret to its inward callings. This truth, so deep and instructive to the philosophic inquirer into the elements of man's character, is well illustrated in the narrative of the early life of our subject:—

> "Neither of the parents of Elijah was a professor of religion at the time of his birth; but his mother was the subject of deep religious convictions, and was evidently a woman of prayer. She took great pains to guard his moral character, and to instruct him in the truths and duties of the Christian religion. The elements of a religious education were so clearly imparted by even this unconverted mother, and so firmly grafted into his youthful mind, that, at the early age of four years, he was able to pray with a tolerable understanding of the nature and obligations of prayer. The habit of secret

prayer, thus formed in early childhood, was maintained for several years, and until, through the influence of evil associates, he had in a measure thrown off the restraints of religion."—P. 44.

The story of the introduction of Methodism into the region along the Hudson, makes one of the most attractive chapters in its deeply interesting history. We have seen the waste condition in which it lay at the time that Methodism began its mighty march over the country. At the conference held in Philadelphia, September, 1788, the whole region from New-York city to Canada, along the line of the Hudson river and Lake Champlain, was laid out in six circuits, and the whole committed to the superintendence of the Rev. Freeborn Garrettson, with nine or ten young men as assistants. This was the practical beginning of the office of presiding elder. The whole enterprise was conceived and executed with a boldness and energy characteristic of the times and the men,—a higher style of chivalry does not illumine the annals of knight-errantry. Turning to the memoirs of the leader of this invading corps, we find a brief account of the affair, which we adopt as better than any we might write:—

> "After conference adjourned, I requested the young men to meet me. Light seemed reflected on my path [he had never seen the country], that I might give them directions where to begin, and which way to form their circuits. I also appointed a time for each quarterly meeting, requested them to take up a collection in every place where they preached, and told them I should go up the North River to the extreme parts of the work, visiting the towns and cities in the way, and on my return I should visit them all, and hold their quarterly-meetings. I had no doubt that the Lord would do wonders, for the young men were pious, zealous, and laborious."

Of the list of circuits making up this earliest presiding elder's district, Dutchess was the second in geographical order, extending some forty miles northward from the Highlands, and including the whole of the vast county from which it was named, with large portions of contiguous territory. A slight inroad had been made into it before this conference, and *ten* members were set down to it. All to the north of this was entirely new ground. This arrangement included the residence of the parents of the future bishop within a Methodist circuit, and presently brought the news of salvation into their very neighborhood. The power of the divine Spirit powerfully accompanied the word, and many were thoroughly converted to God. Among the most successful agents under God, in this great work, was the truly wonderful Benjamin Abbott, who was sent to Dutchess circuit in 1789, and was honoured of God in bringing the mother and grandmother of young Hedding into the

Church, as well as of deeply impressing his own mind, though a child of only nine or ten, with a solemn sense of religion.

A few years later (in 1791), his parents removed to Starksborough, Vermont, then a new and sparsely-settled country, beset with all the discomforts and disadvantages of a frontier settlement. The morals of the people were even worse than were those of his native place, and the partial provision for religious instruction of his former residence, was replaced by almost entire destitution in this. Among such influences—as bad, it would seem, as Satan himself could have selected—was the tender mind of this youth to receive its fashion and impress. To human judgment his ruin would have seemed inevitable; but God had better things in store for him, and for his Church through him. Of this part of the narrative we shall favour the reader with one or two pretty long extracts, though they trench rather largely upon our room:—

> "Four or five years after the Hedding family settled in Starksborough, the entire town remained nearly destitute of religious meetings and privileges. . . . . . The Methodist itinerants, though ranging the country in every direction, had not as yet penetrated into that part of the State. About this time, however, a Methodist family moved into the neighbourhood. The man and his wife were both devotedly pious. Finding that there were no Sabbath-meetings in the community, they invited their neighbours to meet at their house, and regular Sabbath services were kept up by them for two or three years, and until the appointment became regularly included within the newly-formed circuit of Vergennes, in 1798. The meetings were usually opened by singing and prayer, conducted by the man himself, and afterward one of Wesley's Sermons or a portion of Baxter's Call would be read by some one appointed for that purpose. Young Hedding was usually called upon to read on these occasions; and though reluctant at first, the exercise soon became far from disagreeable. . . . . . By these means he became intimately acquainted with this pious couple. They were thorough Methodists, experimentally and practically. They were intelligent, well versed in Methodist theology, and well supplied with Methodist books. In these books, which were loaned to him, young Hedding found a new source of mental improvement. They were read through and through, conned over and discussed, till he had not only read every book published by the Methodists, but absolutely mastered their contents. Thus did he early, and before his heart was renewed by grace, become thoroughly conversant with the system of Wesleyan theology; and, in preference to every other, he embraced it heartily, and without the least mental reserve, as combining the grand truths embodied in the Bible."—Pp. 57–8.

We next change the scene, and by advancing one stage forward, present another living picture in this spirited panorama.

> "In the year 1798, the aggressive spirit of the Methodist itinerancy began to make systematic inroads into Vermont. . . . . . Up to this time the mother of young Hedding, and the pious couple of whom we have spoken, were the only Methodists in the town of Starksborough. But now a host was raised up. The revival was remarkable, not only for the number of its subjects, but also for the variety of their characters, and the powerful manifes-

tations of the Spirit of God, in many of their meetings. . . . . . During the first six months of the work of grace that was spreading through the region, young Hedding attended the meetings, but obstinately resisted the strivings of the Holy Spirit. . . . . . One Sabbath, after he had been reading in meeting, this pious woman, after the congregation had separated, addressed him with such an earnest exhortation that his heart was deeply affected; and as he journeyed homeward, he turned into a grove, and kneeled down by a large tree, and covenanted with God to cease from his follies and sins, to part with all his idols, and to devote himself sincerely and earnestly, and at any and every cost God might require, to the great work of his soul's salvation. Over fifty years after, and but a short time before he was gathered to his fathers, referring to this event, he said to the writer: 'In that hour I solemnly made a dedication of myself to God. I laid my all—soul, body, goods, and all—for time and for eternity, upon the altar, and I have never, *never*, taken them back.' He did not then, however, find relief, aside from the conscious satisfaction of having done his duty, nor did he receive any satisfactory evidences of his acceptance with God. 'This,' said he, 'was the first time in my life that I remember to have had the full consent of my will to part with all my sins for Christ's sake.'"—Pp. 64–5.

This was the turning point in his life, the event which in its influences and results made him what he became. It should be here noticed that neither then, nor even afterward, did he look upon this as the time of his spiritual regeneration and adoption of God; he still recognized himself as a lost and unforgiven sinner. But through grace he had chosen the better part, and that choice, steadily persisted in, necessarily, in the economy of grace, resulted in his conversion and salvation. We direct attention to this point, more particularly, from an apprehension that it is often overlooked or undervalued. The most interesting point in the history of a redeemed sinner, is that in which the unsettled impulses vibrate between the opposing influences of good and evil, and the will, like a balance, trembles with almost equal tendencies to either side, while the destinies of eternity hang upon the decision. Compared with this, even the hour of earnest prayer, and the moment of faith's first great triumph in the power of the cross of Christ, are of less earnest interest. These are but stages in the development of the great work of personal salvation,—that is an initial, and in an important sense, a self-originated process. Having taken this step, and being favoured with religious instructions and stimulants to earnest efforts for a conscious assurance of the divine favour, it was not long before Hedding was enabled to rejoice in God his Saviour.

It is an employment altogether worthy to engage the meditations of a devout and philosophic mind, to examine and elucidate the mental processes which have occurred in innumerable instances and with great uniformity of manifestation, by which young persons have been led forward, often against strongly opposing circumstances, and still stronger personal disinclinations, to devote their

lives to the labours and sacrifices of the Methodist itinerant ministry. It is vain to attempt to account for these things by any merely psychological theory, which ignores the distinctively religious element, or refers the whole to subjective causes. The evidences of objective spiritual influences, and of the directing agency of an unseen Providence in these things, are too patent to be overlooked by any but the perversely blinded; and only by recognizing these things can we account for the efficiency of the incidental agencies by which the manifest results are produced. The history of the subject of these pages, is one of the many that illustrate this matter, and brings it within the sphere of our observation. We again avail ourselves of the language of our author, to present our subject:—

> "The economy of the Methodist Church was well calculated to develop the talents of such young men. It trained them not in seminaries and colleges, but in the field of action. However indispensable the former have become in a later age—an age of more refinement and of more general intelligence—the latter was the only one that could meet the emergencies of those times. First, the simple narration of Christian experience—the tale of spiritual conflicts and triumphs, of sorrows and heavenly joys, uttered weekly among sympathizing and encouraging brethren in the class room; then the exercise of prayer in the social assembly, often gathered to mingle in songs of praise and fervent intercessions at the mercy-seat; next the exhortation in the public assembly; and finally, the ministration of the word to assemblies, convened often in private houses, rustic in their character, but hungering for the bread of life—such a training kept alive the holy fire in the heart, and at the same time developed that ready and effective practical talent admirably adapted to the times.
>
> "Such was the school in which young Hedding was being trained for the great work of God in which he was afterward to take so conspicuous a part. At first his own convictions in relation to his duty were not clear; and he determined that nothing should induce him to enter the ministry before he was clearly convinced that he was called by God to the work. The preachers sometimes told him that it was his duty to preach, and once, at a quarterly conference, a license was offered him; but he uniformly replied that he was not satisfied that God had called him, and he was not willing to run before he was sent. His views of the great responsibilities of the minister's calling, and the necessity for eminent qualifications, as well as a special call from God himself for the work, and, withal, his views of personal unfitness, made him unwilling to believe it his duty whenever the subject was presented to him. Still he could not divest his mind of the impression that he ought to preach, and waited for God to make known to him his duty in such a manner as would remove all doubts. In the mean time he was constantly, and with absorbing interest, engaged in the study of the Bible. He continued also to exercise his talents in public prayer and exhortation as opportunity offered. The love of Christ fired his heart, and his fine and already somewhat exercised talents were often employed with powerful effect."—Pp. 72–74.

The convictions of the Church in this case seem to have outrun those of the young man himself, as to his call to the ministry; and accordingly, in less than a year after his conversion, he was licensed

as an exhorter, and began to hold religious meetings. The next year, a vacancy having occurred in a neighbouring circuit, caused by the departure from it of the eccentric Lorenzo Dow, under an impression of duty to preach the Gospel in Ireland, the young exhorter, then less than twenty years old, was thrust out, much against his wish, to supply the place. Here is the story of his labour, in this his first essay in the Methodist itinerancy:—

> "His labours here were of the most arduous character. It required not less than three hundred miles' travel to complete one round upon the circuit, which occupied four weeks. During this time he held regularly three meetings on the Sabbath, and met class at the close of each; and at least one, often two, on each day of the week, besides frequent prayer-meetings. During this period young Hedding, being only an exhorter, conscientiously avoided the show or fact of preaching. He says of himself, that 'instead of taking a text I delivered an exhortation usually about an hour long.' His word was in demonstration of the Spirit and with power; revivals broke out, the work of God moved forward in every direction, 'and much people was added to the Lord.' It was now fully evident that he was a chosen vessel unto God to bear his name before the people and the Church. Having filled the time of his engagement, he returned home, and renewed his former occupation upon the farm."—Pp. 75–6.

During all this time he had carefully excluded from his own mind all notion that he was, in fact or in office, a preacher. He regarded the ministerial character with an awful reverence, and conceived himself to be altogether unfitted for its solemn responsibilities. Yet his mind was not at ease. He could not help looking forward to the time when he should be thrust out into its duties, though he was slow to believe that one so wholly insufficient as he considered himself, could be called to such a work. At length he so far yielded to the drawings of his own spirit, seconding the frequent suggestions of his Christian associates, as to attempt to preach at a meeting which he had appointed for exhortation and prayer. This experiment was fatal to his long-cherished notions of exemption from the duties of the ministry. "From that time," says the biographer, "he never doubted but that he was called to the work of the ministry." He now only awaited the call of Providence to enter upon his designated work. Nor was this long delayed: he was soon afterward called for by the presiding elder to supply a vacancy on Plattsburgh circuit, and was soon after permanently appointed, for the remainder of the conference year, as junior preacher on Cambridge circuit, on the east side of the Hudson River.

In this informal manner was begun that course of ministerial life and labours in and for which he became so deservedly celebrated. He had not chosen the work, but had evidently been providentially prepared for it and now led into it; on the one hand the divine Spirit

by degrees made his path of duty plain, and on the other he was not disobedient to the heavenly vision. On the 16th of June, 1801, he was regularly admitted, by the New-York annual conference, on probation in the travelling connexion; and thus was formally initiated into that career which during his subsequent life filled both his heart and his hands.

Some notice of the work upon which he thus entered may not be inappropriate in this place; and we again avail ourselves of our author's remarks:—

> "The circuits were large, often requiring three to five hundred miles to complete one round, and this round was completed in from two to six weeks, during which a sermon was to be preached and a class met daily; and often three sermons and three classes to be attended on the Sabbath. The journeys, too, were performed . . . on horseback, through rough and miry ways, and through wildernesses where no road as yet had been cast up. Rivers and swamps were to be forded. Nor could the journey be delayed. On, on, must the itinerant press his way, through the drenching rains of summer, the chilling sleet of spring or autumn, and the driving blasts or piercing cold of winter; and often amid perils, weariness, hunger, and almost nakedness, carrying the bread of life to the lost and perishing. And then, when the day of toil was ended, in the creviced hut of the frontier settler, the weary itinerant, among those of kindred hearts and sympathies, found a cordial though humble place of repose." . . .
>
> "The people, though willing, were poor, and the support was often inadequate to meet the *necessities* of even a single man; but woe to the man and the family that were dependent for a livelihood upon the compensation received for such labours as these. And yet these were men—men sensible to suffering and want—men of tender sympathies for wives and children! . . . Such were the toils, hardships, and privations endured by our fathers in transforming the waste wilderness into a delightful vineyard, and making it as the garden of God."—Pp. 84–6.

The Methodist itinerancy has always been a school as well as a service; though in those early times its facilities for self-culture were as imperfect as were its other appliances. Yet in not a few instances did these hardy itinerants surmount all its difficulties, and acquire not only great practical knowledge, but also very respectable literary attainments. How these things were managed in the case in hand our author thus states:—

> "His almost daily public labours, the long and toilsome rides between his appointments, the great scarcity and high price of books, the difficulty of obtaining suitable accommodations for study, and the almost utter impossibility of obtaining any adequate help by way of instruction, were some of the difficulties that were to be encountered and overcome by him who would show himself to be a workman that needed not to be ashamed. With these difficulties Mr. Hedding resolutely grappled. The woods were often his study; the Bible, and "that elder scripture," also written with God's own hand, were the great text-books from which he drew forth the treasures of knowledge and truth. 'I was glad,' says he, 'during the summer, to get into the woods, and find an hour or two to read my Bible and some other religious books that I

> could carry in my saddlebags. In the winter, I was equally glad to get the same privilege by the fireside in a small log-cabin of but one room, and the fire surrounded by a family of children."—Pp. 90–1.

It is well known to those who knew him, that Bishop Hedding was no mean scholar, even if measured by the advanced standard of our times, and that thoroughness rather than comprehensiveness was the characteristic of his scholarship. The secret of his success generally we see in the foregoing statements; the means by which he attained to his characteristic thoroughness is shown in what follows:—

> "It was thus, step by step, that young Hedding plodded his way along, using his little leisure and his few books to the best possible advantage. Whenever he encountered a difficulty, he ceased not to grapple with it till it was fully overcome; nor did he lay down a book until its contents had been thoroughly mastered, and it will be scarcely too much to say, permanently stored away in his own mind."—P. 93.

For a period of twenty-four years, Bishop Hedding, before his election to the episcopacy, received his annual appointments at conference, and prosecuted the duties assigned him, on circuits, and stations, and presiding elders' districts. The fields of his labour lay, after the first few years, wholly in the New-England states; and when the New-England conference was separated from New-York, he became identified with that work. In the introduction and establishment of Methodism in New-England—itself one of the most romantic, as it is perhaps the best recorded portion of our denominational history—he was an active and most efficient agent, and in its stirring scenes and forlorn but heroic labours he spent the flower of his manhood; and upon it no doubt he left the impress of his own great spirit, which remains his noblest and most enduring monument.

From the beginning of the quadrennial series of general conferences in 1808, till his election to the episcopate, Mr. Hedding was at each session a delegate from the New-England conference. He was thus brought into contact with the ruling minds of the Church, and his attention was directed to its governmental polity. A subject so well adapted to his modes of thought could not fail to engage his attention and to receive in turn the advantage of his enlightened and comprehensive counsels. Among the questions of Church polity which during this period engaged the attention of the great council of the Church, no other elicited so much interest as that familiarly known as the Presiding Elder question. This subject is pretty fully discussed in these pages. In giving an account of the General Conference of 1824, Dr. Clark remarks:—

> "Several new measures were proposed for the action of this Conference; but none created greater excitement, or occupied more the attention of the conference than an effort to make presiding elders elective by the conferences. A motion to this effect had first been introduced into the General Conference of 1808, and was thoroughly discussed by the ablest men of that body; but it was decided in the negative, by a vote of fifty-two in favour, to seventy-three against it. . . . At this session of the General Conference the subject was again introduced by a motion from one of the New-York delegates, [Rev. Laban Clark.] As before, it elicited a great deal of discussion. Able and eloquent speeches were made both for and against it. The measure was again lost, though by a decreased majority—forty-two voting in its favour and forty-five against it. It appears that the delegates from the Philadelphia, New-York and Genesee Conferences were unanimous in its favour. The New-England conference delegates were we believe, mostly in favour of it; but the Southern delegates were generally united in opposition to the measure."—Pp. 211–12.

The further history of this affair is, that, in 1816, when the measure was again brought to a vote, it was for the third time defeated by the decisive vote of sixty-three against it to thirty-nine for it; but in 1820, the other side had the preponderance, and on a division the measure was carried (modified somewhat in form but unchanged in its general character) by a vote of sixty-one against twenty-five. At this point the issue of the matter in which the conference seemed so nearly to harmonize was interrupted by episcopal interference. Bishop McKendree entered his protest against the measure as unconstitutional, in which step he had been preceded by Rev. Joshua Soule, who had just before been elected bishop, but now refused to be ordained because of this action of the conference. Deference to the episcopacy has always characterized the Methodist ministry; yet in this case, the convictions of the conference as to their rights in the matter, and of the expediency of the measure, were too clear to allow them to entirely recede from their position. They, however, consented to suspend the operation of the new law for four years, at which time it was further suspended till the next General Conference, in 1828, when, under the pressure of the great Radical controversy, it was finally repealed.

This question possesses an interest at this time, chiefly, though not exclusively, historical. It belongs to the past, but is not wholly remote from the present status of the Church. As a question of right, the whole power of the Church, in all matters of administration, whether exercised by the episcopacy or by the annual conferences or the General Conference, belongs to the presbytery,—the aggregate body of the ministers—*elders*, it should be. This body is present by representation in the General Conference, and there they have all power pertaining to the ecclesiastical corporation, except wherein they are expressly limited by their constituents. On what ground then such a measure could be said to be unconstitu-

tional, we are wholly at a loss to conjecture. It is, however, almost universally the case, that all new measures of legislation are met with this objection, by the opposing party.

As the inherent right of the ministry in this matter is obvious, so it seems most reasonable that they upon whom the tremendous appointing power is to be perpetually exercised, should be in the most intimate and sympathetic connection with those who exercise that power; nor is it strange that those truly great men, who carried this measure through the General Conference of 1824,—the greatest, as a class, we verily believe, that ever directed the affairs of American Methodism,—thought they should best accomplish this purpose by having the appointing power lodged in hands selected by themselves for that immediate purpose; men directly of themselves, and presently to change places with those whose destinies for a season were now at their disposal. That men should in any case submit themselves to such an arrangement, excites the wonder of all who consider the subject from without; and it is certainly due to those who do this for the good of the Church, that they should have credit for their loyalty in waiving their rights for the common good; and not that they should be told in effect that their only right in the matter, is to obey the dicta of a *superior order* of ministers. We rejoice, however, to know that no such pretences are now made, either by the bishops of the Methodist Episcopal Church or in their behalf. The same scape-goat that bore away from us a large share of another "great evil," took away also with it the soul of this Methodistic prelacy. Our ministers have hitherto submitted cheerfully to the present mode of appointing the presiding elders, and of fixing the annual appointments of the preachers,—because they have confidence in the wisdom and fidelity of their bishops,—and while they do so we do not see that any third party need trouble themselves with the subject. But if at any time they should prefer some other method of doing this, they have an undoubted right to their choice in the matter.

There is another view of this subject, of which but little is said, but which we believe demands the most serious attention from all concerned. There are those who believe that in a large and influential portion of the Church, the appointing power is steadily, not to say rapidly, departing from the hands of the bishops, but not to fall into those of the presbytery, nor of their representatives. These tell us that indeed our bishops still sit in the chair of authority, surrounded by their unauthoritative council of presiding elders; but in many cases, for but little more than to make formal registrations of the informal but efficient decrees of a power unknown to the

theory of our Church government. This external pressure is said to be at this time steadily felt in all the Northern and Eastern conferences, and each year we are told, carries it further Southward, and in the West its development is rapid in proportion to the growth of everything that takes root in that prolific region. Our bishops, even now, say they, are unable to withstand it, and the presiding elders—the mere creatures of episcopal authority, as to their official being—bring them no additional power. Such a state of things may well be satisfactory to that portion of the Church who so potently though inostensibly dispose of its affairs; and also, as far as mere worldly considerations are concerned, to those who receive the appointments, since now they have ready access to those with whom are lodged their future worldly interests. We honestly believe, that at this time there is in this very thing more latent danger to our itinerancy than in any other. Our Episcopacy is grappling with a ubiquitous, intangible, but most potent rival, and there is cause to fear the issue will be against them unless they be aided. Whence that aid may come from we shall not attempt to determine; nor shall we insist that this fearful tendency could be withstood were the appointments made by the united power of the bishops and the conference.

It is not at all wonderful that Bishop Hedding, as have some others, changed his views on this question as he advanced in years. It is no unusual thing for the successful favourite of a popular movement, when invested with power, to abandon the cause by virtue of which he was elevated. Nor is this necessarily a cause of reproach, but often otherwise, since the more comprehensive views of the subject gained from his new position, often change the whole aspect of the case. But apart from this: power tends directly to make men careful, so that frequently the greatest radicals are effectually cured by charging them with responsibilities. But that which, when properly tempered, may be a cardinal virtue, sometimes becomes no virtue at all by its excess; and hence conservatism is at best of a doubtful character. That old men, and men of cool temperaments, especially when they are charged with weighty responsibilities, incline to this extreme rather than the other, cannot be denied; nor will the utterance by us, of so patent a fact, be construed offensively. If, therefore, we use this consideration in explanation of the fact that Bishop Hedding changed sides on the famous "Presiding Elder Question" as he advanced in years, we have a philosophic basis for our theory; and, without passing any judgment upon his earlier or later opinions, we in so doing cast no reproach upon his good name.

But while we most cheerfully concede the good bishop's honesty

of purpose in the matter, (we would contend for this, were it questioned,) and freely consent that this superannuated question should still enjoy its "quietus," we are not altogether pleased with the reasons assigned against the proposed change. It is assumed that our annual conferences are incompetent to make such elections with discretion,—that all elections in the conferences are great evils, and that the infusion of the popular element into our ecclesiastical affairs is to be deprecated. Such an assumption, we believe, is not sustained either in theory or by the evidence of facts. That it is prelatical and despotic in its tendencies is obvious, and we insist that the general results of experience go to prove the trustworthiness of Methodist ministers in these things as well as in all others pertaining to their legitimate functions. Our British Wesleyan brethren have exercised a like power, and to a much larger extent, ever since the death of Mr. Wesley, and we have yet to learn that any great inconvenience has arisen from this source. And we are not prepared to grant that American Methodist ministers are not fully their equals in this thing. But the argument, if sound, proves more than probably any one is ready to admit. If "the bad effects of electioneering in selecting delegates for the General Conference," give evidence that the election of presiding elders by the annual conferences would be an evil, they also, and *a fortiori*, prove that the election of delegates to General Conference, by the annual conferences, is an evil. What then? Shall they too be appointed by the Episcopacy? Or rather, shall we do without General Conferences, and commit the legislative, as well as the executive and judicial power of the Church to the bench of bishops? Probably Bishop Hedding would have resisted such a proposition had it been made in his time, as decidedly as any man; and yet his arguments necessarily lead to that result. But his heart was right even when his head got slightly wrong, and though he might argue faultily, his administration was always liberal and in perfect integrity of purpose. We regret that this doubtless well-meant, but really ill-favoured argument has been given to the public, not only because it is naught in itself, but especially because it does injustice to its illustrious author.

At the General Conference of 1824 two bishops were to be chosen, and party lines were drawn to some extent upon the Presiding Elder question, though not very strictly, especially by the majority. As an interesting passage in Methodist history we give the following statement of the election:—

"This question entered largely into the canvass for the election for bishops. The conference having determined upon the election of two, each party brought

> forward their strong candidates. On the one side Joshua Soule and William Beauchamp, and on the other Elijah Hedding and John Emory were brought forward for the suffrages of their brethren. On the first ballot there were one hundred and twenty-eight votes cast, requiring sixty-five for an election. Joshua Soule had sixty-four, Elijah Hedding sixty-one, William Beauchamp sixty-two, John Emory fifty-nine, and ten scattering. On the second ballot Joshua Soule had sixty-five, and was elected; Elijah Hedding sixty-four, William Beauchamp sixty-two, and John Emory fifty-eight, and five scattering. [Query:—Were there more than one name on a ballot? If not, how did one hundred and twenty-eight votes count one hundred and eighty-nine? If so, (and how could that be when only one was to be chosen,) why were there not two hundred and fifty-six as on the first ballot?—*Rev.*] Rev. John Emory withdrew his name from the canvass; and on ballotting a third time, Elijah Hedding received sixty-six votes and was elected."—Pp. 300–1.

The office to which he was thus chosen was not only unsought, but sincerely undesired by the bishop elect. In his views the office was indeed entirely non-prelatical, yet he considered the Methodist episcopacy a valuable prudential arrangement, but believed that his circumstances rendered it inexpedient, if not impracticable, for him to assume its duties; and so he, soon after his election, declared to the conference. But frequently it is as difficult to get rid of unsought honours as generally it is to obtain coveted ones. His convictions were overruled by the persuasion of his friends, and at length, after the conference had by a unanimous vote invited him to do so, he assented, declaring "that he must receive the voice of the Church as the voice of God in the matter."

As to his suitableness for the elevated post in the Church thus assigned him, the biographer happily remarks—and the whole Church will respond to the truthfulness of his utterances; the picture is truly that of a model bishop:—

> "Bishop Hedding brought to the episcopal office a sound and deep piety, whose ardour had not been abated through a period of nearly twenty-six years, most of which had been spent in laborious service, and in the midst of many trials and privations in the cause of Christ. His mind, naturally clear and discriminating, had been well matured by reading and study, by intercourse with men, and by a large and well improved experience. He was possessed of great simplicity and sincerity of manner—a peculiar and confiding openness in his intercourse with his brethren, that at once won their confidence and affection. At the same time, his natural dignity and great discretion made him an object of reverence as well as of affection. Also his great shrewdness, and his almost instinctive insight into the characters of men, guarded him from becoming the dupe of the crafty and designing. His heart was as true as it was large in its sympathies. His brethren never in vain sought his counsel or his sympathy. It was evident to all that he had one object in view, the salvation of men and the glory of God. In the exercise of the episcopal functions he developed [illustrated] those rare qualifications that had distinguished him as a presiding officer, and especially as an expounder of ecclesiastical law. The soundness of his views upon the doctrines and discipline of the Church has been so fully and so universally conceded, that in the end he became almost an oracle in the Church in these respects; and his opinions are [still] regarded with profound veneration."—Pp. 303–4.

Of Bishop Hedding's labours in the episcopacy we shall attempt no history. Nor need we; for whoever would see the whole in its details must read Dr. Clark's biography of him; or if only the general summing up of the matter is called for, who that has the least smattering of Methodist ecclesiastical history has not heard of his diligence, fidelity and self-sacrifice in the service of the Church? Certain matters relatively incidental but really not the less valuable, may properly engage a passing notice. Among the duties devolving to a large degree upon the bishops at this time, was the settling of the character of our ecclesiastical law, and of its practical administration. The cast of Bishop Hedding's mind eminently fitted him for this work, which afterward occupied a large share of his attention. His recorded "decisions," and especially his "Discourse on the Administration of Discipline," have doubtless done much toward establishing our economy upon a uniform and equitable basis. The great confidence reposed in his judgment in such matters occasioned him much labour, especially during the later years of his life, in answering the numerous inquiries, and solving a multitude of cases, real or supposed, which were submitted to him. But it may be questioned whether decisions given in such circumstances have any general practical value. A case made up for the purpose, or a real one known only by a brief and often ambiguous *ex parte* statement, can form a very insufficient basis for a judicial decision; and it is obvious that to have an intelligent decision the case on which it rests must be well understood. The exposition of law is a function of the judiciary, and it would seem that only when acting in that capacity, that is, when presiding in an annual conference in judicial session, is it proper that a bishop should authoritatively "answer a law question." The multitudinous decisions found scattered upon the journals of nearly forty annual conferences must, from the nature of the case, be of very little value, and perhaps in many cases mischievous. These remarks, however, do not apply to such discussions of general principles and expositions of the spirit of our disciplinary statutes, as are found in many of Bishop Hedding's letters, and still more at large in his "Discourse." These constitute an invaluable commentary upon our ecclesiastical code, and should be carefully studied by every administrator of the Methodist discipline.

The cause of academical and collegiate education in the Church, always found in Bishop Hedding a steady and consistent supporter. Though both his official duties and the want of early academical advantages, precluded him from any very intimate connection with the internal arrangements of institutions of learning, yet he rendered the most efficient and timely aid to the cause, by his personal

influence and judicious approval of them, at a time when such help was especially needed. A prejudice not wholly unreasonable, and certainly venial in those who entertained it, had grown up among our people, against the Church's engaging in that enterprise, to remove which and bring about a better conviction, required both decision and discretion. The business, however, was most effectually accomplished, but not by one or two men alone, but by many, among whom their sons in the Gospel, and the recipients of the early fruits of their enlightened policy and zealous perseverance, love to recognise the names of a Fisk, an Emory, a Ruter, and a Bangs, —and though not so directly prominent yet equally conspicuous, that of Hedding.

It was impossible to write a biography of Bishop Hedding, and entirely avoid the ever-present and interminable slavery question, and we must do Dr. Clark the justice to say that he has evinced a greater degree of straightforwardness in his remarks on the subject than we have been accustomed to find in similar productions. The bishop's connexion with the question, both officially and personally, was too intimate to allow the subject to be passed over in silence. To have said that from his youth he considered slavery a *wrong*, both morally and politically, would have been saying very little; for this was at that time the common sentiment of the whole North, and to a good degree of the South too, especially among the Methodists. His own personal observations of the practical workings of the system, could have had very little tendency to mitigate his early dislike of it; though the complicity of the Church with the "great evil," and the difficulty in the way of its "extirpation," may have somewhat unsettled his convictions and inclined his mind to seek out some apology for its manifest iniquity. If, however, he was at any time, under the force of circumstances, made to seem to be an apologist for slavery, his position belied his character, and could be occupied only so long as prejudice or passion should obscure the face of truth. The anti-slavery agitation in the conferences of New-England and northern New-York, beginning about twenty years ago and continuing about ten years, and eventuating in the secession of several prominent ministers and a large number of lay-members from the Church, forms a painfully interesting chapter in our denominational history. The time to write that history is not yet; nor will it be till the great conflict between freedom and slavery shall have reached the "beginning of its end." In this great agitation, Bishop Hedding became deeply implicated in the prosecution of his official duties, and of course his actions and motives were at times subjected to severe and often intemperate

animadversions. Choosing neither to re-discuss nor yet to seem to dodge this subject, we will here quote at large Dr. Clark's well-timed observations, made at the conclusion of his account of this affair, agreeing as we do most heartily, with what is there presented:—

> "It is but just to say that we have felt no disposition to impugn the motives of the men who took the lead in this movement. We cannot doubt the honesty of their convictions and the sincerity of their motives. Could they at the outset—before their minds had become prejudiced by opposition to their measures, and their affections alienated from the Church—have seen the inevitable results to which their course tended, they would undoubtedly have paused, and at least assumed positions and adopted measures less offensive and less perilous. Or while their hearts were yet imbued with the tender sentiments of brotherly love, could they have foreseen the alienation of Christian feeling, the turmoil and strife that would be engendered in the Church, they would have hesitated. And, indeed, it must not be concealed that they were often goaded by the rude personalities with which they were assailed, and also by the opprobrious epithets that were heaped upon them. We confess that at this distance of time, on looking through the files of the current newspapers of that day—those which took the lead in opposition to these radical movements—we are painfully impressed with this fact. Many things were written and said that it would have been well for the fair fame of Christian love if they had never existed.
>
> "So also, on the other hand, Bishop Hedding may have uttered or written some things too palliative in relation to slavery, and may have seemed more anxious to vindicate the South—especially Methodists who were involved in "the great evil"—than at the present day seems fit or appropriate. But it must be recollected that the evils inseparable from the system have since been more fully developed, and in that day the existence of slavery was generally deplored by good men in the south as an evil; and also that its enshrinement as a "divine institution" is of more recent origin. Taking all these facts into the account, we then have a ready interpretation and vindication of his action in the fact that the Church was placed in great peril, and he was bound by the most sacred obligations to guard its integrity. Rather than compromise the well-being of the Church, he suffered himself for a time to be placed in a false position before the world, and to suffer obloquy such as has rarely fallen to the lot of a good man in this age to suffer. These things he endured—not doubting of the present approval of Heaven, and of the ultimate approval of the Christian world. By his firmness in this hour of trial he performed a great service for the Church and for the cause of God."—Pp. 534–5.

Incidental to this question of slavery, was another not at all related to it, and yet, in the sequel, closely entangled with the controversies to which it gave rise—that of the extent and limitations of the powers, severally, of the presiding bishop, and of the associated body of ministers in an annual conference. These mutual rights have never been very clearly defined—perhaps they cannot be—and so while they call for courtesy and mutual forbearance, they also may be the occasion of contentions, and mutual encroachments and resistance. If pressed to one extreme the bishop would be utterly powerless; and whether the business, to accomplish which the conference is called, and for the doing of which the bishop

is responsible to the General Conference, should be done at all, would be a matter wholly subject to the will of an irresponsible majority of the conference. Such surely is not the design of the law in the case, though much has been said, and that very plausibly, in its defence. On the other hand, it is equally evident that an annual conference is not a powerless assembly, incapable of acting in anything except by virtue of certain definite grants of privileges, beyond which it may not, only by special favour, express an opinion nor recommend a course of action; though possibly by a rigid construction of certain provisions of the Discipline, such might seem to be the law in the case. If such a construction were indeed to become established as the law of the Church, and were the usages of the administration conformed to it, probably very few, beyond the merest sycophants, would ever be found a second time in such a body. There is danger, therefore, in either extreme, and unquestionably our admirable Church regulations would be powerless for good, were they not administered and executed in the spirit of peace and mutual confidence.

That some of the anti-slavery leaders, especially in the New-England conference, claimed too much for themselves in the shape of conference rights, is very probable; that the bishops, following up the unusual, and, we must think unwarrantable, action of the General Conference of 1836, endeavoured to extend their prerogatives a little too far, is not altogether improbable. A strange infatuation, at that time, possessed the public mind, from which the wisest and best were not wholly exempt; an indefinite but most potential notion that "abolitionism," like treason in despotic nations, worked a universal forfeiture of human rights. That such epidemic delusions do prevail at certain seasons must be confessed in order to explain the otherwise inexplicable actions of good men. At such times, too, men of the proscribed party take the prevailing influence by contraries, and are driven to the opposite pole of the sphere, to abide their time of recompense, or to be overcome in the conflict. To give to the parties to this unhappy contention the advantage of these considerations is no less just than charitable.

With a brief notice of one further case, that of the celebrated John Newland Maffitt, we must pass from the consideration of Bishop Hedding's administrative acts. For nearly a quarter of a century that strange individual had ranged the whole field of the Church, ecclesiastically a local preacher, and ostensibly an evangelist, but really a professional revivalist working for pay. His course was the occasion of much scandal to the Church from without, and of great grief to those who watched over its welfare from within; but it was

found exceedingly difficult to remedy the evil. Toward the end of the year 1846, Mr. Maffitt came to New-York, bringing a certificate of Church membership, and united with one of the churches in that city, as a local elder. Here charges involving his ministerial and moral character were presently preferred against him, to which he was required to plead. This, however, he chose not to do, but asked of his minister a regular dismission from the church. That, of course, could not be granted while charges were pending against him; but the minister, willing to be rid of a disagreeable duty, returned to him the paper on which he had been received in that church, with which he sought and obtained admission to a church in Brooklyn, then in charge of one of his partizans. The Brooklyn minister now notified the complainants that he was ready to try the case on the charges they had made; but they denied his jurisdiction in the matter, and held Mr. Maffitt to his responsibilities to the Church before which he was first accused; thus giving rise to a complicated question of jurisdiction. In this emergency the interference of Bishop Hedding was invited; and he, seeing the necessity of the case, consented to bring to bear upon it the power of his office in an unusual, but as he believed, a wholly legitimate form. He accordingly examined into all the facts of the case, and then authoritatively declared that Mr. Maffitt's membership had been legally fixed in the New-York church, and never legally removed, and therefore it remained there still; so that there, and not elsewhere, might he answer to the complaints laid against him.

The action of the bishop, in this business, was, at the time, variously estimated by different persons, and certain questions of administration involved in it are yet unsettled. As to the goodness of his motives there can be but one opinion. That the case presented a real emergency is scarcely less certain; and all must honour him for his moral courage in meeting the storm before which others—and some of those to whom the business primarily belonged—had succumbed. But the question as to the legality of his mode of proceeding is not so clear. To determine the question of a person's membership in a particular church or society, pertains to the interior administration of such church or society, and for this, as for other cases of administration, the preacher in charge is responsible to his annual conference. How then, it is asked, does it belong *eminently* to the episcopacy? Our bishops are indeed pastors of the whole Church, but their pastoral oversight extends to the church-members through their duly-appointed pastors; that is, not immediately in any case, but always through the exercise of the appointing power. By this power too, such a case as that under notice,

could be fully reached by the episcopacy, for if the incumbent minister refused or failed to do his duty he could be replaced by another.

We are entirely uninformed as to the grounds taken by Mr. Maffitt's friends against the bishop; but whether they were, or were not valid, would not have availed much. When people are satisfied that the right end has been reached in such a case, they are not apt to be over-scrupulous about the process. So in the General Conference of 1848, some who openly dissented from the report of the Committee on the Itinerancy approving this action, waived all opposition, presuming that "the emergency of the case may have justified the irregularity of the proceeding."

Omitting whatever else in the active life of Bishop Hedding might seem to deserve attention, we pass on, to contemplate him in the final chapter of his earthly history. Though often a great sufferer from painful chronic complaints, the results of exposures and privations in early life, he nevertheless continued his active duties till he was a little past seventy years old, or till near the close of the year 1850. About that time his strength suddenly and almost entirely gave way under an attack of acute disease, from which he never recovered, though he continued to suffer for more than a year and a quarter. To contemplate him in the condition into which he was thus brought, may constitute a fitting close to this hasty review of his life.

First, it should be observed, that though Bishop Hedding was most thoroughly a worn-out man, as to his physical system, and though he had attained to an age at which most men have entered upon a state of manifest senility, yet, to all appearances, his intellect suffered neither weakness nor obscuration to the last. It is a question not wholly unworthy of examination whether the distressing decay of the mental faculties so common with old people is really unavoidable. Two classes of persons are especially liable to this calamity: those who never really think at all, with whom the brain is an unused organ, and therefore never well developed, and so most certain to fall into premature decay; and those whose minds are overworked by intense and protracted excitements, inducing a monstrous and unequal development, till at length outraged nature refuses to be thus overtaxed, and a more or less violent collapse ensues. A vast amount of both physical and mental labour may be performed, by persons of only ordinary abilities, if undue efforts be avoided, and the powers of action be well husbanded and diligently exercised. The promises of long life, and of strength in old age, depend for their fulfilment, perhaps, not less upon the general arrangements of Prov-

idence, than upon any special interpositions in behalf of the virtuous. Nor is it necessary that the mental powers should decay with the physical. The relations of the soul to the body are such that it may rise undimmed from the ruin of the latter. It indeed seems to be the normal condition of the case, that when the body falls, like the ripe fruits of autumn, in healthy maturity, it should leave the soul—of which it is only an appendage—uninjured by the separation. It is that forced maturity which arises from blighting or disease that carries down soul and body together into feebleness and drivelling senility. Bishop Hedding at threescore and ten, though physically worn out, possessed his mental powers unenfeebled, and buoyant with instinctive energy, as the result and recompense of temperance and well-regulated mental and bodily activity.

It is often found to be the severest trial of faith to which the Christian minister, who loves the work of his calling, is subjected, to be forced to believe that his work is done. It was probably not less the blameless promptings of nature, than zeal for the cause of God, that suggested to the poet of Methodism the prayer, that he might

> "His body with his cross lay down,
> And cease at once to work and live."

The conflict of that hour is often most painfully severe, especially when it comes suddenly and unexpectedly. Such, however, was not Bishop Hedding's case, for he had long awaited that solemn crisis with a cheerful expectation. At first, from the violence of the attack that prostrated him, it appeared that his release was about to be sudden; and with this prospect before him his soul exulted in holy joy. And when, by the mitigation of his malady, a temporary reprieve was granted him, his spirit still enjoyed the unutterable peace of the Gospel. But the last spiritual conflict was not yet past. After resting in this heavenly frame of mind for three months from his first attack, he became the subject of the most fearful temptations. His heart seemed to misgive him; the evidences of the truth of Christianity, though logically conclusive, failed to sustain him; and even his own experience of the divine faithfulness became unavailing. But he who through grace, had foiled the adversary in a thousand conflicts, was not now "ignorant of his devices." Seeing that the tempter had attacked not the judgment, but the feelings, he did not attempt to reason himself out of his painful doubts, but called mightily on God for the aid of the Spirit, to dispel these fearful clouds from his soul; and the triumph presently granted him, was as complete as the conflict had

been severe. From that time till his decease, his peace was uninterrupted, and his assurance unclouded. Seldom, perhaps, has the poet's picture of "the chamber where the good man meets his fate" beer more fully realized, than in his case. There were witnessed the holy quiet, the immovable calmness, and the profound peace which distinguishes that most heavenly of earthly scenes. Yet in all this holy peace, there was no mingling of self-commendation or confidence in what he had done; but the deepest humiliation and self-abasement, coupled with a simple reliance on the atonement for present and eternal salvation.

"I have been a most fallible creature," were his own words, uttered but a short time before his decease: "I have always needed the atonement of Christ, and have trusted in that alone for the forgiveness of all my shortcomings. I used to wonder how it could be that Christ could have mercy on such a poor miserable sinner as I am, and save me. There was a kind of mist over the subject; but within a few days this has all been cleared away. I now see such goodness, such glory, such power in the Redeemer, that there is now no difficulty in it."

The closing scene shall be presented in the biographer's own words:—

"About three o'clock on the morning of the ninth of April, 1852, a change took place betokening the near approach of death. Early in the morning his sufferings were great; his extremities were cold, and his death agony was upon him; but his intellectual powers—consciousness, perception, memory, reason, were unaffected. Several Christian friends witnessed his dying struggles, and the glorious triumph of his abiding faith. The Rev. M. Richardson came in, and inquired whether his prospect was clear; he replied with great emphasis: 'O, yes, *yes*, YES! I have been wonderfully sustained of late, beyond the usual degree.' After a pause, he added: *I trust in Christ, and he does not disappoint me. I feel him, I enjoy him, and I look forward to an inheritance in his kingdom.*"

* * * * * * *

"Thus passed away one of the purest and noblest spirits of our earth. He died as might have been augured from his character and life; he died as the Christian only can die. Up to the last moments of earthly communion, he was calm and serene. Eternity was breaking upon his view, but he knew in whom he had believed. To see the Christian, who, with the intellect of a philosopher and the wisdom of a sage, had scanned the evidences and the doctrines of the Gospel to their very depths; to see such a one maturing for the skies, going forth to the last conflict with no misgivings of spirit—calmly, firmly, constantly trusting in the atonement of his Saviour; to mark his trembling humility, the low estimate he placed upon his services in the Church of Christ, and upon his Christian piety—these were privileges of no ordinary moment, and afforded lessons of indescribable value."—Pp. 658–662.

Long as this article has become, we find ourselves compelled to close it abruptly, omitting several important points which we had marked for notice—especially the author's estimate of Bishop Hedding's character, found in the last chapter of the volume, and the Introduc-

tion by Bishop Janes. We, however, regret these omissions the less since it is not our purpose to make this paper a substitute for the volume itself, but rather to invite the reader's attention to it, and to excite in him a desire to peruse it. There only can he find full satisfaction upon the subject.

Art. VII.—HUC'S TRAVELS IN CHINA.

A Journey through the Chinese Empire, by M. Huc, author of Recollections of a Journey through Tartary and Thibet. New-York: Harper & Brothers. 2 vols. 12mo.

M. Huc's volumes present a picture of Chinese morals and manners which would form one of the most amusing publications of the day if it were not at the same time the most revolting and saddening. The sight of a vast empire demoralized and brought into a state of practical—nay more, even theoretical—disbelief of justice, mercy, and truth in this world and the next, is surely enough to make the light heart heavy. All this is none the less painful from the evidence these volumes afford of the general diffusion of education, industry and ingenuity among the Chinese. M. Huc has evidently a strong and serious feeling with regard to the condition of this great people, and a wish to make them better. Of this we need no stronger proof than the earnestness with which he devoted himself to the missionary work among them; enduring on this account a voluntary exile of many years from his native land. As a Roman Catholic propagandist, he cannot, of course, command our sympathies; nor, indeed, would he thank us for them. Whatever of Christian feeling or thought may exist in China, he ascribes, everywhere and always, to his own Church. Thus, for instance, after speaking of the prevalence of Christian doctrines among the Chinese insurrectionists, he says:—

> "The Chinese have also for a long time had at their command a precious collection of books of Christian doctrine, composed by the ancient missionaries, and which even, in a purely literary point of view, are much esteemed in the Empire. These books are diffused in great numbers throughout all the provinces, and it is more probable that the Chinese innovators have drawn the ideas in question from these sources than from the Bibles prudently deposited by the Methodists on the sea-shore."

Yet M. Huc is wonderfully charitable for one of his faith; or

rather, he *means* to be so. His sins generally lie more in the way of omission than of commission; and consist in a total forgetfulness of any Christian labours without the pale of his own communion. In truth, these volumes say little about M. Huc's missionary labours, or about religion in any sense, for reasons thus assigned:—

> "It is our purpose to address readers of all opinions, and to make China known to all; not merely to preserve the memory of facts connected with our mission. These interesting particulars must be sought in the "Annals of the Propagation of the Faith," those veritable bulletins of the Church militant in which are recorded the acts of apostles, the virtues of neophytes, and the struggles and sufferings of martyrs. Our object in these volumes has been to describe the theatre of this peaceful warfare, and to make known the populations that the Church of God desires to subject to her rule, and bring within her fold. We hope it will then be more easy to understand the long struggles of Christianity in China, and to appreciate its victories."—P. xxi.

Opportunities for accurate observation have seldom or never been enjoyed by travellers in China, who are restricted by the *exclusive* spirit of the Chinese, to a stay in Macao and Canton, with, perhaps, a visit of form to Pekin. M. Huc gives so good an account of their privileges that we quote his words:—

> "The situation of travellers in China is not usually an enviable one. At their departure from Canton they are imprisoned in closed boats; they are guarded carefully from sight all along the great canal; they are what we may call put under arrest immediately on their arrival at Pekin; and, after two or three official receptions and interrogatories, they are hastily sent back again. As they are not allowed the slightest communication with the outer world, they can really describe from their own knowledge nothing more than the hedge of soldiers by which they have been surrounded, the songs of the boatmen who have accompanied them, the formalities employed by the inspectors who have searched them, and the evolutions of the grandees who prostrated themselves with them before the Son of Heaven. The history of the whole affair has been given by one of these travellers with as much *naïveté* as precision. He says, 'They entered Pekin like beggars, staid in it like prisoners, and were driven from it like thieves.'" *—Pp. xix, xx.

Over travellers such as these our author has certainly great advantages; a ten years' residence in the celestial empire, with French manners, Jesuitical cunning, and perfect command of the language, gave him opportunities for familiar intercourse with Chinese society, even in its higher ranks, which no other European has ever enjoyed. Nor was the author's long stay his only advantage. He and his companion travelled from the borders of Thibet to Canton as state prisoners, with all their expenses paid in the most liberal manner from the imperial treasury. They were lodged everywhere at the "Communal palaces," at which only the grandees of the empire or envoys of government are entitled to be entertained. The account of this triumphal

* Account of the Embassy of Lord Macartney.

tour (for thus the genius of M. Huc developed it) is indeed marvellous. Many a time does he make large drafts upon our faith, causing us to remember the parting paragraphs in the preface which he quotes from the scarcely more marvellous accounts of the Venetian, Marco Polo. Yet, withal, we are inclined to give M. Huc credit for a good share of veracity, unless where the "honor and glory of his Church and her orders" are concerned.

The portion of his Chinese experience which our traveller does give us here, is incomparably interesting; narrated, moreover, in a most readable manner, which is a great consideration. The clear, logical Frenchman, with all his tact and talent, is visible in every page. Quick-witted and quick-sighted, he seizes and displays the novelties which China is so rich in, with graphic and even dramatic skill. His coolness and ready repartee stood him in good stead in dealing with the mandarins, for they respect courage and enjoy wit. Moreover these Mandarin directors of society are not accustomed to equals; to superiors they give implicit reverence; inferiors they govern with an iron hand. Travellers generally fall into the last category; but M. Huc was too wary even for the serpentine Mandarins; and they always appear *hors du combat* at the close of these laughable encounters. His perpetual good humour is also a marked characteristic, which makes him a most desirable travelling companion. Always taking the soft side of inconveniences, and the bright side of disappointments, his cheerfulness is quite infectious, and keeps the reader good humoured in spite of himself. When the Chinese, under pretence of treating them better, would treat them worse than their written instructions warranted, the polite Frenchman could not think of giving so much trouble, and insists upon his courteous hosts doing "nothing more than the viceroy has directed." Again when the travellers are taken to a miserable inn, (though by name the "Hotel of Accomplished Wishes,") instead of the communal palace at which they should have been lodged, the missionary could not think of remaining there, because "it would so much grieve the viceroy to hear how his commands had been disregarded." The prefect who has charge of the palace does not decline this great honour by telling the truth, and saying it costs too much money; that would be entirely unlike a Chinese, to whom a lie seems always best. He declares how unbounded would be his joy at entertaining (for even a day) men from the great kingdom of France, but, alas! the palace is in such fearful disorder from workmen; and, moreover, there are in the grand saloon seven or eight coffins containing the dead bodies of official persons of the district, waiting till their families should come to remove and bury them. This last argument

would indeed have proved conclusive to most Europeans; but, alas for the prefect's pocket, he had found his match in diplomacy for once. The missionary replies,

> "That since probably the viceroy was not aware of the communal palace having been converted into a cemetery, it would be well to write to him to that effect; since, if he happened to travel this way himself, he might not, perhaps, find it pleasant to take up his abode among coffins and dead bodies; but that as far as we were concerned it did not make the slightest difference, as we were not much afraid of the living, and not at all of the dead. We should go to the palace, therefore, and did not doubt but we should be able to make ourselves very comfortable there. The prefect did his utmost to deter us from this "almost insane" project; and at last, to have done with him, we told him that he might settle the matter at his good pleasure, provided only that he would write and sign a statement that we, having wished to rest for a day at the communal palace of Kien-tcheou, had not been allowed to do so on account of its being in an uninhabitable state. The prefect perfectly understood our meaning; and turning to some subaltern officers who were in waiting, he said: 'I am of the same way of thinking as our guests; it is absolutely necessary they should have a day of repose. Let orders be immediately sent to Koung-kouan to take away the coffins and put things as they ought to be, and let the guardians take care not to be again guilty of the same fault.' Ten minutes afterward we were proceeding in state, in our new palanquins, to the communal palace. As we went out we just whispered in the ear of Master Ting, 'Remember, if we are not properly treated, we will remain two days instead of one.' Strange country, in which it is necessary to behave in this way in order not to be oppressed and ill-treated yourself."—Vol. i, pp. 200, 201.

The result proved the Frenchman's sagacity, for the palace was by far the most elegant they had yet seen, and they were treated with great distinction. This capacity for outmanœuvring even the wily Chinese would indeed make our traveller seem contemptible, if we did not keep in mind, that he was playing for his life, which was in the hands of his escort; and one false or timorous move would probably have ended their pilgrimage in some ditch behind the ramparts of a Chinese town, as many of their worthy predecessors had finished theirs.

Let us leave M. Huc's personal narrative for a time, that we may look at the facts he gives in reference to these curious people. The most striking feature of the Chinese is their entire dissimilarity to every other nation. All their habits and customs appear to us inverted. Whether we take externals — which display the hair removed from the crown and eyebrows and falling below the knees in long tails, the faces stained an orange colour to increase their beauty—or conquering our antipathy for these strange looking specimens of humanity we follow our author into the dining saloon, to the school, or to the state apartment, there is the same feeling of contrast and opposition. True, we have been told wonderful stories of the Chinese cuisine; of the dishes prepared with castor oil,

of shark fins, fish gizzards, goose feet, peacocks' combs and other delicacies of the same sort; but all these wonders exist, acccording to M. Huc, in the imagination of the traveller, or perhaps in the mischievous attempts of the Canton merchants, who sometimes amuse themselves by inventing dishes for Europeans which a Chinaman has never seen. Surely, however, to begin dinner with the dessert and end it with soup; "to drink wine smoking hot out of little China cups, and have your food brought to you ready cut up into small pieces; to be presented with a couple of sticks instead of a knife and fork to eat with; to have a quantity of little bits of coloured silk paper beside your plate, instead of napkins, which are carried off by the attendants as soon as used;" to leave your place between the courses to smoke or amuse yourself; to put your chop sticks on your head and then across your tea cup as an indication that you have dined; all these are enough to satisfy the most inveterate searcher for novelties, without need of further wonders in the *quality* of the viands.

In the paying of visits, everything is prescribed by a code of etiquette called "the Rites," which details the minutest particulars, and is obeyed with religious exactness; a great saving of embarrassment, doubtless, but a wonderful expenditure of ceremonious words and genuflections; in flexions of all sorts, in fact; for hands, head and knees have alike an active part to perform. In some of these polite phrases we are reminded of the French leaders of *ton* and our own followers of them; who, in striving to follow, far outstrip their more graceful masters. The Chinese "gentleman," when intending to call upon a friend must despatch a servant several hours before hand with a note, which is apt to run thus: "Your disciple, or your younger brother so and so has come to bow his head to the ground before you and to offer you his respects." This phrase implies an inquiry as to his friend's willingness to receive him; it is written on red paper; the size of the sheet being regulated by the rank of the person addressed and the degree of respect to be testified. Even the size of the letters bear the same proportion to the magnitude of the individual. Large characters must be used when you wish to mingle a certain air of "stateliness with your courtesy," and the characters diminish in proportion to the interest one has in appearing humble and respectful. The conversation must always begin on indifferent, mostly insignificant subjects, and gradually rise in importance till the last moment, when you may explain what really brought you there. M. Huc concludes his account of one of these ceremonies: "The visitor then rises and says, 'I have been troublesome to you a very long time;' and doubtless of all Chinese compli-

ments, this is the one that most frequently approaches the truth." Another part of this pantomime requires that when invited to *stay;* one should have the politeness to *go* immediately. Our good missionaries, under cover of their want of Chinese breeding, often opposed these exactions; and many a laugh have we enjoyed at the expense of these unwilling hosts, who "were so overwhelmed with shame at these undeserved honours to their mean and unworthy selves."

As to the state of the people generally, M. Huc's narrative gives us little cause for hopefulness; a supreme indifference to truth, and capacity for lying, seems to pervade the whole vast empire. Whether we look at the officers of state or their menials, the gentleman or the tradesman, prefects or mandarins, all are alike (with a very few exceptions) deceitful and treacherous. The mandarins with whom our traveller had to deal, were almost universally of this character; lying to and cheating each other and the travellers with equal assiduity; yielding only to superior cunning or superior strength. There is one exceptional case, however, which is so pleasing that we quote the account of the interview:—

"The first magistrate of I-tou-hien is, unquestionably, the most accomplished person we ever met among the Chinese functionaries. He was quite a young man, somewhat weakly, with a pale face, apparently attenuated by study. He had obtained the degree of doctor in Pekin, when he was scarcely more than a child; and his gentle and spiritual-looking countenance was rather set off than otherwise by a pair of gold-rimmed spectacles of European manufacture. His conversation, full of good sense, refinement, and modesty, was really delightful; and the exquisite politeness of his manners might have reconciled any one, ever so averse to them, to the Chinese rites. On our arrival we found a splendid collation of delicious fruit, laid out in a cool, fresh pavilion, in the midst of a garden shaded by large trees. Among the rarities of this rich dessert we remarked with pleasure cherries of a brilliant red colour, fine peaches, and other fruits that do not grow in the province of Hou-pé, and we could not help expressing our surprise at the circumstance. 'How could you possibly procure such rare fruit?' said we to our amiable Mandarin.

"'When one wishes to please friends,' said he, 'one always finds means to do so. The resources of the heart are inexhaustible.'

"We passed the whole day and part of the night in talking to this interesting Chinese. He had many questions to ask concerning the various nations of Europe; and he always made his inquiries in a serious, judicious manner, worthy of a man of high intelligence. He did not ask one of the puerile, silly questions to which his brother Mandarins had accustomed us so much. Geography appeared to be the subject that most interested him, and he had a great deal of very accurate knowledge concerning it. He surprised us very much by asking whether the European governments had not yet realized the project of cutting through the isthmus of Suez, so as to connect the Mediterranean with the Indian Ocean; and we found him very well informed concerning the extent and importance of the five parts of the world; and the space that China occupies upon the globe."—Vol. i, p. 340.

It may surprise our readers a little to hear of a great difference in manners and customs in different parts of China; these vary as much,

perhaps, as in Europe. Yet it is not really surprising when we remember the vast extent of the empire, and that it is composed of a number of kingdoms, under the dominion of various princes, and ruled by distinct legislation. All these governors are under the rule and appointment of the emperor, who calls himself the "Father of his people." He is also called "August Elevation," and "August Sovereign;" "but his title *par excellence* is Tien-tze, or Son of Heaven."

> "Being the son of Heaven, and consequently, according to the Chinese expression, Father and Mother of the Empire, the Emperor has a right to the respect, the veneration, the worship even of his children. His authority is absolute; it is he who makes and who abolishes the laws, who grants privileges to Mandarins or degrades them, to whom alone belongs the power over life and death, who is the source of all administrative and judicial authority, who has at his disposal the whole power and revenues of the empire; in one word, the state is the emperor. His omnipotence, indeed, extends even farther, for he can transmit this enormous power to whom he pleases, and choose his successor among his children, without any law of inheritance imposing a restraint upon him in his choice."—Vol. i, p. 106.

Absolute as this authority is, it has limits; the appointment of all officers, civil or military, is in the Emperor's hands, but he must make his choice from the "lettered class *only*," and in conformity to certain established arrangements. Universal suffrage is granted to the three hundred millions of mortals this father numbers in his family; and every distinction is accessible to all, without regard to wealth or position. One *sine qua non* there is, however; applicants must undergo an examination upon literary subjects, and the result of this proves them worthy of an appointment in the first, second, or third ranks. All officers, civil and military, are divided into nine orders, which are distinguished from each other by coloured balls the size of a pigeon's egg, worn above the official caps. Plain red coral marks the first order; carved, the second; deep blue the third; pale blue the fourth; crystal the fifth; white the sixth; gilt and wrought copper the remainder. Here we have another instance of the *inverting* genius of the Chinese—for titles are not hereditary, nor do they bestow any rank upon the sons; but look backward and ennoble the ancestors of the fortunate individual; an idea too whimsical for any but the retrograde brain of a Chinese. Yet we must look with a little respect upon this *literary* aristocracy. Surely the organization of the government of a vast empire by literary qualifications alone, is a grand thought, if the material for its execution were equal to the conception. The government of China is indeed a vast system of centralization, of which the emperor is the centre. Invented many centuries ago, and preserved almost intact by the blind veneration of the people for what has been handed

down to them, numberless revolutions have served to modify it a very little, without ever once shaking its foundations. Of the present revolution M. Huc is very chary in giving judgment; leaving time to give a verdict for him; a species of wisdom we shall do well to imitate.

Let us look for a moment at the educational advantages M. Huc sets forth as belonging to the Chinese. "There is *no* country," he says, "in which primary instruction is so widely diffused as this; there is no little village, not even groups of houses in which a teacher is not found, and every Chinese knows how to read and write. On their junks, even on the small canal boats, one is sure to find an arithmetical machine, an annual register, pamphlets, a writing-desk and writing (not pens but) brushes for the use of the sailors." The Chinese tutor is charged "not only with the *instruction* (as our author expresses it) but also with the *education* of his pupil." Morals and manners, with the forms and ceremonies of both public and private life, all come within his jurisdiction. Their chief branches of instruction are writing, reading, and a good deal of learning by heart; which last the Chinese insist is the true method for elementary instruction. Their most popular primary work is a sort of encyclopædia called the Sacred Trimetrical Book, which is a concise summary of the chief branches of knowledge the Chinese call science. This, well committed to memory, is followed by the "classical" books, which are mostly composed from the text of their great philosopher Confucius. Amid masses of rubbish there are here some gems of real worth which we thank M. Huc for giving us. But our limits forbid more than one quotation exhibiting a school in progress:—

> "For the knowledge and good pronunciation of the character, the master at the beginning of the lesson, repeats a certain number to each pupil, according to his capacity. They then all return to their places, repeating their lesson in a chanting tone, and rocking themselves backward and forward. The uproar and confusion of a Chinese school, in which every pupil is vociferating his own particular monosyllables in his own particular tone, without at all troubling himself about his neighbour, may easily be imagined. While they are thus chanting and rocking about, the master of the school, like the leader of a band, keeps his ears pricked and attentive to all that is going on, shouting out his amendments from time to time to those who are missing the true intonation. As soon as the pupil thinks he has his lesson perfectly impressed on his memory, he goes up to the master, makes a low bow, presents his book, turns his back, and repeats what he has learnt. This is what they call *pey-chou*, 'turning the back on a book;' that is, saying a lesson.
>
> "The Chinese character is so large, and so easy to distinguish, even at a great distance, that this method does not appear superfluous, if the point is to ascertain whether the pupil is really repeating from memory. The bawling and rocking themselves about is considered to lesson the fatigue of study."—Vol. i, pp. 133, 134.

And now, a brief survey of the religious element in this vast empire, must conclude this paper. If we glance first at the Christians of China, we cannot come to any favourable impression from the narrative of the French missionary. In point of numbers he rates them at about eight hundred thousand, which sounds well *only* when far separated from the three hundred millions which inhabit this country. Then, too, if we inquire yet more closely we find that but a very small proportion of these know anything more than the mere name, which their baptism (it may be in childhood) has imposed upon them. These same Christians profess Buddhism or Mohammedanism if it seems profitable, and again Christianity if they wish to get married or receive some favour at the hands of the priest. Romanist as he is, M. Huc rarely speaks with satisfaction of their sincerity or faithfulness. It is to be hoped, however, that the fruits of Protestantism do not so nearly resemble apples of Sodom, as (from these accounts) do those of Romanism in China. The government, professedly tolerant of all religions, under the avowed belief, that all are alike false, looks upon Christianity with an evil eye, under the belief that its missionaries are secretly agents of their governments at home. who are sent with the hope of making subjects for an earthly instead of a heavenly king. An instance we give below:—

> "The Christian religion is designated in China as Tien-tchou-kiao, that is to say, the religion of the Lord of Heaven; the idea of God being expressed by the word Tien-tchou. One day we were speaking of religion with a really superior sort of Mandarin, a very intelligent fellow. He asked us who was that Tien-tchou, whom the Christians adore and invoke, and who had promised to render them rich and happy in such an extraordinary manner. 'Why,' said we, 'do you, a learned man of the first class, a well-instructed man, and one who has read the books of our religion, do you ask this? Do you not know who is the Tien-tchou of the Christians?'
>
> "'Ah, you are right,' said he, putting his hand to his forehead, as if to recall a half-vanishing recollection; 'you are right, I ought to know; but I really had forgotten all about this Tien-tchou.'
>
> "'Well, you know now; who is he then?'
>
> "'Oh, to be sure, everybody knows—he is the Emperor of the French!'"—Vol. i, pp. 173, 174.

The Chinese feeling in regard to religion is generally that of supreme indifference. Materialism seems rooted and grounded in the very nature of the people. They have many animal enjoyments, and a few intellectual; but the idea of God, the soul, or a future state seems incomprehensible to them. True, they will talk on all these subjects with not a little show of sense, but you discover at last that your most earnest efforts have been thrown away and your listener is just where you found him. Nothing more plainly indicates this desolating scepticism than a

formula of politeness exchanged between persons on their first meeting:—

> "It is customary to ask to 'what sublime religion' you belong. One, perhaps, will call himself a Confucian, another a Buddhist, a third a disciple of Lao-tze, a fourth a follower of Mohammed, of whom there are many in China, and then every one begins to pronounce a panegyric on the religion to which he does *not* belong, as politeness requires, after which they all repeat in chorus, '*Pou-toun-kiao, toun-ly*,' 'Religions are many; reason is one; we are all brothers.' This phrase is on the lips of every Chinese, and they bandy it from one to the other with the most exquisite urbanity. It is indeed a clear and concise expression of their feelings on religious questions. In their eyes, a worship is merely an affair of taste and fashion, to which no more importance is to be attached than to the colour of your garments."—Vol. ii, p. 192.

This indifference is, indeed, as M. Huc says, the chronic malady of China, and it must prove the greatest of all barriers to the progress of the truth. The following account so aptly illustrates the state of mind in question, and affords so complete a specimen of the difficulties which Christian missionaries must encounter in approaching the better educated men of China, that we quote it at length:—

> "In one of the principle towns of China, we were for some time in communication with a lettered Chinese, who appeared extremely well disposed to embrace Christianity. We had several conferences together, and we studied carefully the most important and difficult points of doctrine, and finally, by way of complement to our oral instruction, we read some of the best books. Our dear catechumen admitted, without any exception, everything we advanced; the only difficulty was, he said, the learning by heart the prayers, that every good Christian ought to know, in order to say them morning and evening. As he seemed nevertheless to desire putting off to some indefinite period the moment in which he should declare himself a Christian, every time he came to see us we urged him to do so, and made the most earnest representation of the duty of following the truth, now that he knew where it lay. 'By-and-by,' said he; 'all in good time. One should never be precipitate.' One day, however, he spoke out a little more. 'Come,' said he, 'let us speak to-day only words conformable to reason. It is not good to be too enthusiastic. No doubt the Christian religion is beautiful and sublime; its doctrine explains, with method and clearness, all that it is necessary for man to know. Whoever has any sense must see that, and will adopt it in his heart in all sincerity; but, after all, one must not think too much of these things, and increase the cares of life. Now, just consider—we have a body; how many cares it demands! It must be clothed, fed, and sheltered from the injuries of the weather; its infirmities are great, and its maladies numerous. It is agreed on all hands, that health is our most precious good. This body that we see, that we touch, must be taken care of every day, and every moment of the day. Now is not this enough, without troubling ourselves about a soul that we never do see? The life of man is short and full of misery; it is made up of a succession of important concerns, that follow one another without interruption. Our hearts and our minds are scarcely sufficient for the solicitudes of the present life—is it wise then to torment one's self about the future one?'
>
> "'Doctor,' we replied, 'you said when you began, that our discourse to-day should be a reasonable one; but take care, for it often happens, that we think we are listening to the voice of reason, when in fact only prejudice and habit are speaking. Our bodies are full of infirmities you say; that is true, for they

are perishable; and it is for that very reason that we should do better to concern ourselves about our souls, which are immortal, and which certainly exist, though we cannot see them. Our present life, you say, is a tissue of paltry cares. Undoubtedly it is—and that is precisely why it is reasonable to think of that future life which will have no end. What would you think of a traveller who on finding himself at a dilapidated inn, open to all the winds and deficient in the most absolute necessaries, should spend all his time in trying how he could make himself most comfortable in it, without ever thinking of preparing for his departure, and his return into the bosom of his family? Would this traveller be acting in a wise and reasonable manner?'

"'No! no!' replied the doctor; 'one must not travel in that way; but man, nevertheless, ought to confine himself within proper limits. How can he provide for two lives at the same time? If the traveller ought not regularly to take up his abode at an inn, neither ought he to travel on two roads at the same time. When one wishes to cross a river, one must not have two boats, and set a foot in each; one would run the risk of tumbling into the water, and drowning one's self.' This was all we could get out of the doctor, who nevertheless was really a worthy fellow enough, but a most thorough *Chinese.*'"—Vol. i, pp. 177-179.

But the capstone of all their curious customs and ideas, is the popular belief concerning the soul's escape from the body, which they look upon as a voluntary thing on the part (not of the individual) but of the obstinate soul, which has a will of its own to carry it away from its mortal tenement. Therefore, in case of serious illness, all means must be tried to detain the unwilling guest, or compel its return if it has started upon its journey. Prayers and persuasion are tried; then the sufferings of the bereaved family, with ample promises of good treatment from all are detailed. If these means are not successful, force must be used to retain, or threats to frighten back the prisoner. Doors and windows are closed, and the family and friends run in all directions through the room, uttering most fearful cries. Mourning is systematized into a grand farce. Hired mourners fill the air with lamentations and quite relieve the bereaved from the necessity of having any feeling at all. Death is viewed by the Chinese with a sort of animal indifference which is truly shocking. A fine coffin, however, is considered an indispensable part of the household furnishing of all, more or less ornamental, according to the circumstances of the possessor. Children often, when wishing to make their parents a valuable present, put it in this shape, without a fear of its proving an unwelcome remembrancer of mortality.

We should be glad, if it were possible, to lay hold upon one lofty principle in this demoralized people, to wind up our brief summary of their habits; but great as is our inclination, we have no facts, and, therefore, can only hope that this gross darkness is an indication of the dawn of a brighter day.

ART. VIII.—SHORT REVIEWS AND NOTICES OF BOOKS.

> It is of greatest concernment in the Church and Commonwealth to have a vigilant eye how books demean themselves as well as men, and thereafter to confine, imprison, and do sharpest justice on them as malefactors; for books are not absolutely dead things, but do contain a potency of life in them to be as active as that soul was whose progeny they are.—MILTON.

(1.) "*The Rich Kinsman*, by S. H. TYNG, D. D.," (New-York: R. Carter & Brothers, 1855; 12mo., pp. 425,) contains a series of lectures on the book of Ruth, delivered to the youth of the author's congregation on Sunday afternoons. Some parts of the story are made to bear a little too much weight, in the way of allegorizing interpretation; but the book abounds in Christian exhortation and instruction, conveyed in a very pleasing form.

(2.) "*A Treatise on English Punctuation*, by JOHN WILSON," (Boston: Wilson & Son, 1855; 12mo., pp. 333,) is the most complete treatise on the subject—indeed the only complete one—that we have ever seen. It contains also a great deal of information about proof-reading, &c., and, as a whole, is a book which every man who thinks fit to write for the press should make use of.

(3.) "*The Bible defended against the Objections of Infidelity*, by the Rev. W. H. BRISBANE," (Philadelphia: Higgins & Perkinpine, 1855; 12mo., pp. 179.) This book is prepared, as the author modestly tells us, in view of "the wants of Sunday-school teachers and scholars;" but it has merit sufficient to command readers of other classes as well. It does not aim to exhibit, in detail, the evidences of Christianity, but to refute certain infidel objections to the contents of Scripture, such as those currently alleged against the account of the deluge, the divine anger, &c. It is, in fact, a concise commentary upon many passages that present difficulties to unlearned readers, and which are, therefore, dexterously made use of by cavillers.

(4.) The issues of BOHN'S LIBRARIES are continued with unvarying punctuality and promptitude, and the excellence of the series appears to grow with its growth. Of the "Ecclesiastical Library" we have recently received "*The Works of Philo Judæus*," translated by C. D. Yonge, (3 vols., 12mo;) and "*The Ecclesiastical Histories of Sozomen and Philostorgius*," translated by Edward Walford, (1 vol., 12mo.) These editions are more complete and convenient than any that have heretofore appeared.—Of the "Classical Library" we have just received "*Demosthenes' Orations on the Crown and on the Embassy*," translated by C. R. Kennedy, (1 vol., 12mo;) "*Suetonius's Lives of the Cæsars*," translated by Dr. Thomson, (1 vol., 12mo.;) "*Pliny's Natural History*," translated by Dr. Bostock, (1 vol., 12mo.) In the "Standard Library" we find a reprint of Professor William Smyth's "*Lectures on Modern History*," vol. i, which is to be completed in two volumes. One of the most useful books yet published by Mr. Bohn is the "*Hand-Book of Proverbs*," (1 vol., 12mo., pp. 582,) which contains the whole of Ray's collection of proverbs, with large additions collected by Mr. Bohn, and a copious alphabetical Index. All these publications

are constantly kept on sale by Messrs. Bangs, Brother & Co., 13 Park Row, New-York.

(5.) "*A Treatise on Land Surveying*, by W. M. Gillespie, A. M., Professor in Union College." (New-York: D. Appleton & Co., 1855; 8vo., pp. 450.) This is certainly the most complete manual of surveying that has yet appeared. It gives a full view of the *theory* deduced, with much skill and originality, from the elementary principle of coördinates; and the *practice* is taught in clear and simple language, with ample illustration. We have not space to give any analysis of this excellent book, but we earnestly commend it to all teachers in schools and colleges.

(6.) "*Rich and Poor, and other Tracts for the Times*, by the Rev. J. C. Ryle," (New-York: Carter & Brothers, 1855; 18mo., pp. 360,) appears to contain a series of lectures by the author, who writes many books, but yet writes some good ones. This strikes us as one of his best, both in its doctrinal and practical tendencies. The essay on the "Church" is sensible and timely: Mr. Ryle, though an Episcopalian, is too much of a Christian to assert that all who are not members of his own sect are guilty schismatics.

(7.) "*The Philosophy of Sectarianism*, by the Rev. Alexander Blaikie," (Boston: Phillips, Sampson & Co., 1855; 12mo.,) is written by one of the most bigoted sectarians that ever put pen to paper. Every man, in his view, is a sectarian who is not a Presbyterian, and a Scotch seceder at that.

(8.) "*The Chemistry of Common Life*, by James F. Johnston, M. A.," (D. Appleton & Co., 1855; 2 vols., 12mo.,) is an admirable book. It furnishes precisely the kind of knowledge about the world we live in, and the means and conditions of our living, which we most stand in need of, and in which mankind are generally most strangely deficient. It should be a text-book in every family and in every school.

(9.) "*Uhlemann's Syriac Grammar, translated from the German* by E. Hutchinson." (New-York: D. Appleton & Co., 1855; 8vo., pp. 357.) According to the testimony of the most competent teachers and scholars, Uhlemann's Grammar of the Syriac Language is the best extant. Mr. Hutchinson has not only translated it well, but has added a course of exercises in Syriac Grammar, with a chrestomathy and brief lexicon. With the aid of this book, any one tolerably versed in Hebrew can acquire Syriac with great rapidity.

(10.) "*The Mind of Jesus*," (New-York: Carters; 18mo., pp. 132,) contains a series of practical essays on the principal traits in the character of the Saviour.

(11.) "*Methodist Family Manual*, by the Rev. C. R. Lovell," (Cincinnati: Applegate & Co.,) contains the articles of religion, with scriptural proofs, the rules of the societies, with practical notes, and a brief catechism of experimental religion. It is adapted to be very useful as a family book.

(12.) "*The Universe no Desert, and the Earth no Monopoly.*" (Boston: James Munroe & Co., 1855; 2 vols. in one; 12mo., pp. 130 and 239.) The chief object of this treatise is to prove that the planetary and stellar orbs are habitable; but we do not think it successful. The best part of the work is the preliminary volume, which treats of the unity of plan in the creation as exemplified by the comparison of the sciences.

(13.) KIRWAN'S LETTERS have had a world-wide circulation. They are now republished, under an enlarged form, under the title of "*Letters to the Rt. Rev. John Hughes.*" (New-York: Harper & Brothers, 1855; 12mo., pp. 370.) Prefixed to the letters is an introduction, showing that "Romanism is not the religion for America;" and the valuable essay on "The Decline of Popery, and its Causes," by the same author, is printed at the end. In its present form, the work will find, as it deserves, a permanent place on the library shelves.

(14.) "*Reply to Howell on the Evils of Infant Baptism*, by the Rev. L. ROSSER, A. M." (Richmond: 1855; 18mo., pp. 160.) Of Dr. Howell we know nothing, except that he is pastor of a Baptist church in Richmond, and has written a most truculent book against baptism as practised by the evangelical Church in all ages. Mr. Rosser gives a thorough review of the book, and sets forth its sophistical and even slanderous character in strong language; but not stronger than the case demanded.

(15.) "*Speeches and Addresses*, by HENRY W. HILLIARD." (New-York: Harper & Brothers, 1855; 8vo., pp. 497.) The interest of the topics discussed in many of these speeches has passed away; but they deserve preservation from their beauty of form, and from the good principles which generally underlie them. Mr. Hilliard is one of the most liberal and national of the Southern statesmen, and would go as far, perhaps, as any other of his class, in recognising the existence and the rights of the free states; but even *his* nationality, as shown in certain passages in this book, is always limited, when the interests of slavery are involved. He would regard the dissolution of the Union as a calamity; but he would consider the exclusion of slavery from new territories by act of Congress as a greater! Mr. Hilliard's tone, throughout, is that of a sincere and earnest man; and his style has a degree of dignity in accordance with the character of the man and the elevation of his line of thought.

(16.) "*Memoir of Mrs. Lucy T. Lord.*" (American Baptist Publication Society, 1855; 18mo., pp. 288.) This little volume contains a precious record of Christian courage and devotion. Mrs. Lord was the wife of the Rev. E. T. Lord, of the Chinese Baptist Mission, and died in 1853, shortly after returning from Ningpo. The book is simple, unpretending, even careless in style; but it is full of Christian feeling and missionary spirit.

(17.) "*The Six Days of Creation: or, the Scriptural Cosmology, with the ancient idea of Time-Worlds, as distinguished from Worlds in Space*, by TAYLER LEWIS." (Schenectady: G. F. Vandebogert, 1855; 12mo., pp. 407.) Whatever may be thought of the results reached by Professor Lewis in this volume, it is very certain that it contains the most elaborate and thorough investigation of the question, from the philological point of view, that has ever appeared. Its aim is to show that "the creative periods are indefinite, or of a duration not measurable by any subordinate divisions of time derived from the present settled constitution of things." The author's procedure is strictly philological; his object is to find out what *the Scriptures really teach* on this subject; not, to evade or explain away the force of their teachings.

(18.) "*Support of the Ministry*, by A. D. WILLIAMS." (Providence: Day & Co., 1855; 12mo., pp. 72.) This well-conceived essay is divided into three parts, of which the first shows that "the ministry should be supported;" while the second gives an estimate of the proper amount of such support; and the third discusses the methods by which it should be raised.

(19.) "*Art-Hints: Architecture, Sculpture, and Painting*, by J. J. JARVES." (New-York: Harper & Brothers, 1855; 12mo., pp. 398.) The aim of this book is to present, in a popular form, the abstract principles and rules of art, with an outline of its historical progress and social relations. So much nonsense is uttered about "high art," that it is refreshing to get hold of a book treating sensibly, and yet with adequate enthusiasm, of a subject with regard to which the American people are, as yet, intensely ignorant. Mr. Jarves is a thinker as well as an observer; he has studied well the relations of art to Christianity and civilization, and sets them forth in simple, yet manly and forcible language. No single book yet published will do as much as this to foster a genuine love of art, founded upon a just appreciation of its necessity to the complete and healthful development of humanity.

(20.) "*The Hebrew Missionary*, by the Rev. JOSEPH CROSS, D. D.," (Nashville: Stevenson & Owen; 18mo., pp. 242,) contains a series of essays, exegetical and practical, on the book of Jonah. Dr. Cross has made use of the recent discoveries in Nineveh for the illustration of Jonah; and has, in fact, made an excellent practical commentary on the book.

(21.) "*A Visit to the Camp before Sevastopol*, by R. C. MCCORMICK, JR." (New-York: D. Appleton & Co., 1855; 12mo., pp. 212.) Mr. McCormick spent several weeks in the camp before Sevastopol, and had remarkable opportunities for seeing all that could be seen. The officials, English and French, seem to have spared no pains to facilitate his movements. His book gives as clear an account as could be expected of a camp where everything was confusion at the time of his visit. The excellent cuts that accompany the text make it thoroughly intelligible.

(22.) We have received Parts XXIII and XXIV of Copland's "*Dictionary of Practical Medicine*," (New-York: Harper & Brothers,) containing the heads from "Scrofula" to "Symptomatology." Of the merits of this cyclopædia we can only speak from hearsay; medical men give it high praise. The American edition is carefully edited by Dr. C. A. Lee.

(23.) "*Le Curé Manque: Social and Religious Customs in France*, by Eugene de Courcillon." (New-York: Harper & Brothers; 12mo., 1855.) Under a thin veil of story, this little book gives a great deal of minute information with regard to every-day life among a Roman Catholic population. It is as attractive, also, as it is instructive.

(24.) "*An Offering of Sympathy to the Afflicted*, by Francis Parkman, D. D." (Boston: James Munroe & Co.; 12mo., pp. 259.) This volume is chiefly a compilation, from various writers, (mostly Unitarian,) of consolatory thoughts and reflections, especially adapted to the grief of parents suffering under the loss of children. The sudden death—by burning—of Dr. Parkman's child, first suggested the preparation of this book, and "taught him more effectually how to sympathize with the sorrowful."

(25.) Messrs. Munroe & Co. have published a new edition, from the stereotype plates, of "*Virgil, with English Notes*, by Francis Bowen, A. M." (1855; 8vo., pp. 600.) With a carefully printed text, this excellent school edition of Virgil offers a body of notes specially adapted to the wants of young students: sufficiently ample on the one hand to afford the aid indispensable to the beginner, and yet avoiding, on the other, the extreme of overloading the commentary. The work is the fruit of ripe scholarship and a trained and sober judgment.

(26.) "*The Magic Word*, by Alton," (Boston: James Munroe & Co., 1855; 12mo., pp. 183,) contains a collection of verses of various merit. Some of them evince considerable poetic power, while others are worthless.

(27.) "*Mountains and Molehills*, by Frank Marryatt." (New-York: Harper & Brothers; 12mo., pp. 393.) This book contains the "recollections of a journal burnt;" as the notes collected by the author during three years' roughing it in California were destroyed by one of those fearful conflagrations which, some years ago, periodically laid San Francisco in ashes. The book is probably all the better for the loss; it seizes upon the prominent points that have remained in the author's memory, and his power of description is so graphic that he makes his pictures live before you. Personally, Mr. Marryatt was an unsuccessful adventurer; but he carried with him to the mines, and brought away, a treasure of good humour, endurance, and hopefulness far richer than the gold for which he worried the hills in vain.

(28.) We have before spoken, in terms of strong commendation, of Cornell's Primary Geography, and have now to commend, as unreservedly, "*Cornell's Intermediate Geography.*" (New-York: D. Appleton & Co., 1855; folio, pp. 84.) The peculiar merit of the book lies in the adaptation of the text to the maps, and of both to the wants of *young* students. The maps, instead of being crowded with names of towns, rivers, &c., contain only such as the pupil ought to learn by heart; so that his work is always before him, and *no more.* We commend the book to the careful scrutiny of all teachers.

(29.) "*Outlines of Chemical Analysis*, by Dr. Heinrich Will, translated by D. Breed, M. D., and L. H. Steiner, M. D." (Boston: James Munroe & Co., 1855; 8vo., pp. 297.) This translation is made from the third edition of Will's Outlines, which was prepared originally for the use of the celebrated chemical laboratory at Giessen. It affords the student all necessary aid in conducting analysis, giving the very latest and best processes in the simplest and clearest forms.

(30.) M. W. Dodd has published a new edition of "*The Papal Conspiracy Exposed*, by the Rev. Edward Beecher, D. D." (New-York: 1855; 12mo., pp. 432.) As we gave our judgment of the former edition, we only need say of this that it contains, besides the matter of the former, an excellent letter to the Hon. Joseph R. Chandler, in reply to his speech on the Temporal Power of the Pope.

(31.) Messrs. Stevenson & Owen (for the Methodist Episcopal Church, South,) have republished Watson's "*Apology for the Bible*," with a "*Refutation of the Theological Works of Thomas Paine not noticed by Bishop Watson*, by J. O. Summers, D. D." (Nashville: 1855; 18mo., pp. 228 and 284.) Dr. Summers has made a valuable addition to Watson's sensible book. Paine's Works are more read in certain parts of the country than many people are aware; and the little book before us affords a complete antidote to their poison.

(32.) We have received "*A Monograph on Mental Unsoundness*, by Francis Wharton." (Philadelphia: Kay & Brother, 1855; 8vo., pp. 228.) It forms the first part of a forthcoming treatise on medical jurisprudence, and is printed for private circulation only. If the whole work equals this part in clearness and comprehensiveness, it will supersede all other text-books on the subject. Besides a thorough statement of the legal relations of insanity, the work contains a psychological investigation of the subject, which will reward the attention of all who are interested in the study.

(33.) "*Demosthenes on the Crown, with notes*, by J. T. Champlin," (Boston: James Munroe & Co.; 12mo., pp. 264,) is the best edition of this great oration accessible to American students.

(34.) THE second Burnett prize, in Aberdeen, for the best essay on the evidence of the "Existence, Wisdom, and Goodness of God," was awarded, last year, as our readers have already been informed, to a treatise entitled "*Theism: the Witness of Reason and Nature to an All-Wise and Beneficent Creator*, by the Rev. JOHN TULLOCH, D. D." (New-York: Carter & Brothers, 1855; 12mo., pp. 431.) The aim of this book is to offer a complete and comprehensive view of natural theology. The first part treats of the *principles* on which the science rests, namely, the doctrine of causation and that of final causes. The author seeks to establish these against the objections of Mill, and the positivists generally; and so to verify the fundamental theistic conception of a First Cause. The second section illustrates these principles in a comprehensive exhibition of the phenomena of the universe, beginning with the cosmical arrangements, and ending with the mental and moral constitution of man. The third part gives a moral argument from freedom, conscience, and reason. The final section treats of the difficulties which the order of human affairs, in connexion with natural phenomena, throws upon the question of the divine wisdom and goodness: for example, pain, sin, death, &c. It will be seen from this outline that the author embraces the whole field of argument, both *a priori* and *a posteriori*, for the being of God; and that he sets himself, also, to meet especially the forms of materialistic scepticism which particularly characterize our own age. As a whole, the book does not come up to the high expectations we had formed of it; but it is, nevertheless, a very valuable contribution to natural theology, and deserves the careful study of every theologian.

(35.) "*A Trifolium*, by HENRY W. CARSTENS." (Boston: James Munroe & Co., 1855; 12mo., pp. 197.) The three "leaves" of this trifolium are, first, a translation from the German of some very pretty allegorical stories; second, a series of original compositions on various topics, by the author; and third, a lecture on the study of the German and other languages. For a foreigner, Mr. Carstens writes very good English.

(36.) "*Star Papers; or, Experiences of Art and Nature*, by HENRY WARD BEECHER." (New-York: J. C. Derby, 1855; 12mo., pp. 359.) It is hardly necessary for us to notice a book which everybody will have read before our journal can appear. These Beechers are certainly wonderful people, and Henry is the most wonderful of them all. With exuberant fancy, inexhaustible feeling, overflowing natural spirits, and keen powers of observation, he unites a faculty of description, of word-painting, unrivalled among recent writers. Above all, he is rich in that abounding sympathy with "man and woman, and sun, and moon, and stars, and trees," which is the essential attribute of true genius. If, by chance, there be any among our readers that have not read "Star Papers," we advise them, at once, to buy, beg, or borrow it.

(37.) "*The Life of the Rev. Robert Newton, D. D.*, by THOMAS JACKSON," (New-York: Carlton & Phillips; 12mo., pp. 427,) will be treated in an extended article in our next number. In the meantime we commend it to our readers as a sensible narrative of the life of a very remarkable man.

(38.) "*Essays on the Preaching Required by the Times*, by ABEL STEVENS." (New-York: Carlton & Phillips, 1855; 12mo., pp. 266.) This volume contains several articles originally published in this Journal in 1852, together with a series that appeared in the National Magazine in 1854. The papers have been thoroughly revised by the author, and, in their present shape, they offer a homiletical treatise of rare value. In spite of the periodical form in which they were first published, the Essays develop a continuous and connected line of thought. The first three treat of the comparative inefficiency of the modern pulpit, and assign certain causes for it; proposing, at the same time, definite and well-considered remedies. The fourth and fifth essays set forth, in a very masterly manner, the advantages of extemporaneous preaching. The three following chapters exhibit the characteristics of Methodist preaching in particular, as it was, is, and ought to be. The concluding chapter illustrates the principles taught in the body of the work, by the examples of five of the most eminent preachers that Methodism has produced—Summerfield, Cookman, Bascom, Olin, and Fisk. Prefixed to the work is an excellent introduction, by Dr. Bond.

(39.) "*The American Debater*, by J. N. MCELLIGOTT, LL. D.," (New-York: Ivison & Phinney, 1855; 12mo., pp. 312,) is a manual for debating societies, containing rules of order, questions for debate, &c.

(40.) "*Progress, considered with particular reference to the Methodist Episcopal Church, South*, by the Rev. WILLIAM J. SASSNETT, of Emory College." (Nashville: Stevenson & Owen; 12mo., pp. 320.) This book is, in itself, an indication of "progress" such as we should hardly have looked for in the quarter from which it comes. It starts from the proposition that "Methodism, though once all that the age demanded, is now, relatively, a narrow, restricted system," and that there is, therefore, need of development and expansion. The author thinks that Methodism is hindered and hedged in by its devotion to "the one-idea enterprise" to which it was consecrated in the beginning. The needed development must take place in the spheres of "education, literature, charity, missions, and the ministry;" and these titles constitute the heads of the book. The writer's views of education are very thorough, and they are very boldly expressed. He thinks that all education should be controlled by the Church, and that the ministers should be more completely identified with the work of teaching. He condemns common-school education under state control; and lays down a vast plan, extending from the university, with large endowments, fellowships, &c., down to the parish school. Under the second head—literature—Professor Sassnett again finds signal deficiencies to note; the Methodist Church, he thinks, has never come up to her duty in this respect. He tells us, what may readily be believed, that the disruption of the Church in 1844, was fraught with evil to the South in cutting off the people from their old sources of supply in the way of religious literature, while the new fountains have hardly yet been opened. The Book Concern, he thinks, should never aim at making money, but should now, and forever, discard all idea of profit beyond the mere demand for sustaining the business.

As to the function of the pulpit, the author utters some doctrines which must grate harshly upon Southern ears. He holds that its range of topics has been altogether too narrow; that it should adapt itself to the times, and "address itself to the entire sum of the popular wants." In a Northern writer this language would look very *suspicious;* certainly it does not harmonize with the so-called conservative view, generally maintained in the slaveholding region, that the preacher should confine himself to strictly religious themes, in the narrowest sense of the phrase. But Mr. Sassnett, in other places, "defines his position" in a way to satisfy the most violent and oppressive pro-slavery men. He holds that "slavery, both abstractly and concretely, is defensible on the ground of both philosophy and Scripture." Alas! In his concluding chapter the writer enforces his argument by an earnest exhortation to the Church, founded, among other considerations, on the fact that America holds the "most commanding position" possible, for carrying Christianity to all lands. He tells us that

> "the eyes of the civilized world are turned to our own country. So elevated and commanding is its position, that from it are perpetually going out influences, that control largely the current history of the world. If, then, her light be a true light—the light of an exalted Christian civilization—how great and universal are the blessings which it confers!"

How bitter is the unconscious satire of this passage! Professor Sassnett cannot fail to know that in *no* civilized country—except, perhaps, Russia, really no exception—would or could evangelists holding the Southern doctrine on slavery be received as teachers of morality, much less of "an exalted Christian civilization."

(41.) "*Memoirs of William Wilberforce*, by MARY A. COLLIER." (New-York: R. Carter & Brothers, 1855; 18mo., pp. 335.) This is a neat and well-prepared abridgment of the larger life of Wilberforce, compiled by his sons. The selections are judiciously made, and the flow of the narrative is equable and agreeable. This life of one of the few Christian statesmen of modern times deserves to be widely circulated among the youth of this country.

(42.) "*Lays of Ancient Virginia*, by J. A. BARTLEY." (Richmond: J. W. Randolph, 1855; pp. 204.) We give the following specimen of Mr. Bartley's lyrics:—

"O freedom's home! Thy banner streams,
  A meteor on the gale;
And I behold the haughty flags
  Of Europe fade and pale;
And, crowding on the surging seas,
  They cleave the billows bright;
They come to rest beneath its folds,
  Attracted by its light."

From this example our readers can judge tolerably well of Mr. Bartley's poetical capacity.

(43.) "*Slavery Examined in the Light of the Bible*, by LUTHER LEE." (Syracuse: 1855; 18mo., pp. 185.) This book is divided into three sections. The first aims to demonstrate the sinfulness of slavery by moral arguments; the second, to show that slavery finds no justification in the Old Testament; the third, that it finds no refuge in the New. In his zeal for the cause, Mr. Lee adopts several questionable interpretations of Scripture passages. The only safe and tenable ground is, we think, that the *principles* of the Gospel are opposed to slavery. Attempts to show that 1 Cor. vii, 21, and similar passages, do not refer to slaves, as such, must always react against the cause they are meant to support.

(44.) "*Internal Evidences of the Genuineness of the Gospels*, by ANDREWS NORTON." (Boston: Little, Brown & Co., 1855; pp. 309.) This work consists of two parts, the first being in substance a critique on Strauss's "Life of Jesus," (pp. 1-189.) The work was left unfinished by the author, but bears throughout the marks of his large erudition and careful mode of thinking. The first chapter gives a general view of Strauss's theory, showing that it is essentially coincident with certain speculations of Volney in the "Ruins of Empires." The third chapter gives a thorough examination of Strauss's fundamental principles of criticism, and shows their entire want of soundness. The peculiar stand-point of Mr. Norton with regard both to orthodox Christianity and to Rationalism, is clearly manifested in his fourth and fifth chapters; in the latter of which he shows that the essential value of Christianity consists in its being a miraculous revelation of God, without which human reason alone could do nothing toward establishing the facts on which religion is founded. His estimate of the value of German Rationalism, in general, may be gathered from the following passage:—

> "Every one whose attention has been drawn to the strange and multifarious doctrines that have obtained currency in our day, has heard of the speculations of German philosophers (so called) in theology and metaphysics, and knows something of their pretensions and of the boasts of their admirers. The concluding dissertation of Strauss affords abundant materials for forming a judgment of the character and results of those speculations, which all our further knowledge of them may serve to confirm. In this case, if in any, the old proverb holds true, that *it is not necessary to drain the ocean to learn that its waters are salt.* The materials for forming a judgment of this philosophy are not furnished by an opposer of it, by an adherent of common sense, nor by a neophyte giving his crude, mistaken imaginations of what he has imperfectly learned, but by one initiated in its mysteries, who is liable to no suspicion of intending to expose them to reproach or derision."

Nevertheless, Mr. Norton's views of the substance of divine revelation and of the character of Christ are so far removed from those of orthodox Christianity, that his writings, valuable as they are, should be studied with great caution, and are not to be recommended to novices in theology.

The second part of the work consists of a treatise, also unfinished, on the Internal Evidences of the Genuineness of the Gospels. The aim of the first chapter is to show the consistency of the Gospel narrative with itself, and with all our knowledge bearing on the subject. The second chapter treats of the

objections commonly brought against the consistency of the narrative; and the third sets forth the strong internal evidence contained in the character of Christ itself. The task of editing the posthumous papers has been executed with great ability.

(45.) "*A Translation of the Gospels, with Notes*, by ANDREWS NORTON." (Boston: Little, Brown & Co., 1855; 2 vols., 8vo.) This work, like the one just noticed, is posthumous. The translation, however, which occupies the first volume, was completed and revised by the author before his death. Its aim is to "express clearly the meaning of the text, preserving as far as possible the simplicity which characterizes the style of the evangelists." We need not say that the version is made in a careful and scholarly manner throughout; but, as might be supposed, it is tinged occasionally by the author's Unitarian views. These are shown still more strikingly in the "Notes," which make up the second volume of the work. Thus, for instance, in commenting upon John i, 1, Mr. Norton endeavours to show that the word "Logos," as used by the apostle, merely denotes the attributes of God manifested in his works; and that it was John's purpose, in the introduction of his gospel, to declare that Christianity had the same divine origin as the universe itself. The spirit of this note pervades the whole commentary. Apart from this dangerous peculiarity, the work deserves a place in every theological library, and will long remain a monument of the learning and industry of its lamented author. In point of mechanical execution these books are brought out in a style that has never been surpassed, if equalled, by the American press.

(46.) "*Bibliographisch-statistishe Uebersicht der Literatur des östreichischen Kaiserstaates. Erster Bericht.* Von DR. C. VON WURZBACH. (Bibliographical-statistical Review of the Literature of the Austrian Empire. First report.) *Fragmente über das Unterrichtswesen in Oestreich.* L. R. VON HEUFLER." (Fragments on the Educational Affairs of Austria.) (Vienna: 1854.) The authors of both these works are subaltern officers in the Austrian state-ministry, and their reports bear, therefore, an official character. The first gives the highly important statistics of Austrian literature from September 1, 1852, to December 31, 1853; the other explains the principles on which the Austrian government proceeded in attempting, after the revolution of 1848, to reorganize the educational department. Both works bear witness to Austria's great inferiority in literature and education to Protestant Prussia.

When the revolution of 1848 awakened Austria from her lethargy, the whole nation became aware of the sad condition of Austrian literature. In the other German universities half of the professors at least were authors of some note; in Austria hardly one among ten. Among the other German gymnasia there were few that could not boast of at least some one illustrious name in literature; the two hundred and sixty-two gymnasia of Austria saw many a year elapse without recording in the annals of literature one of their members. It was confessed that something must be done. An able minister of public

education could have remedied the evil in a short time; for the other German states, especially Prussia, educated a sufficient number of young scholars to supply, in the course of a few years, all Austrian institutes of learning with able teachers. Unfortunately, however, several reasons worked together to induce the Austrian government to enter into a closer union with the Catholic party than had existed before. They wanted aid from abroad, and applied to the least able foreigners, the Romanists. The selection of men like Phillips, Moy, Höfler (formerly from Munich), Aschbach, (from Bonn,) Weiss, (from Friburg,) Tehr, (from Tubingen,) set the intention of the government in a clear light. It must, however, be said that *some* Protestants were called to the Catholic-Austrian universities, because in some departments Romanism has almost no representatives at all in the universities, (ex. gr., in those of classical and oriental languages.)

A great difficulty presented itself in the reorganization of the gymnasia. In the other German states the faculty of the gymnasium had almost full liberty to select the text-books; in Austria they were prescribed, even for the universities. Those heretofore in use were so utterly worthless, that a change in this respect appeared even to the government as unavoidable. It encouraged, therefore, the elaboration of new text-books, and allowed the faculties of the gymnasia a little more liberty in choosing among them. No text-books, however, can be introduced without the authorization of the government. A cloud of new books has since made its appearance, which, however, for the greater part bear witness more of the partiality of the ministry which recommended them, than of the scholarship of their authors. As a specimen of this kind of literature a "Manual of Ancient Geography and History," by Bumiller, is reviewed by the "Literarische Centralblatt," of Leipzic, which gathers from it very strange and new discoveries in history; ex. gr., that the Roman consuls and dictators were *chosen by the Senate*, that a lustrum lasted *four* years, &c. As the book is Roman Catholic, of course the apostles Peter and Paul must again die as martyrs in Rome, &c. Such books are recommended because they are Catholic, and are frequently, as also this Manual is, translated into Italian and Hungarian. Of course the German periodicals are indignant that the name of German literature is thus exposed to disgrace among nations who are accustomed to look up to it as to a model.

Bad as this situation is, Austrian literature is growing better than it was before 1848. The number of books has been doubled since 1844. In the space of the sixteen months mentioned above, the number of books allowed to be printed was 6874; of which 2787 were in German, 2723 in Italian, 428 in Hungarian, 659 in Sclavonic, 24 in French, 4 in English, 1 in Swedish, 173 in Latin, 7 in Greek, and 14 in Hebrew.

(47.) A THOROUGH work on the "History of the Councils" had long been a desideratum. The manuscripts discovered in late years have been so numerous, the application of a keen criticism to Church history has been so productive, and the insight gained by it into the inner development of the Christian Church is so much more profound than formerly, that none of the older works on this

subject could any longer be considered as sufficient for our times. Dr. C. J. Hefele's (Professor of Roman Catholic Theology at Tubingen) new work, "*Conciliengeschichte*, (History of the Councils: Friburg, 1855,) is, therefore, undoubtedly a very seasonable one. Professor Hefele is one of the few Catholic authors who, instead of disdaining to look at the literary products of learned Protestants, acknowledge their superiority in many respects, and endeavour to reach their profoundness. He is a thorough scholar, whose preceding works (Patres Apostolici, Cardinal Ximenes,) have won for him a well-deserved reputation among Protestants as well as Romanists. The Protestant literary papers of Germany have, therefore, not hesitated to acknowledge the estimable erudition displayed also in his new work. The first volumes bring the subject up to the end of the fourth century. The whole work will consist of five volumes, four of which are ready for printing.

(48.) One of the last survivors of the Romantic School in Germany, Joseph Freiherr von Eichendorf, himself a celebrated poet, many of whose poems are, and always will be, among the favourite songs of the German nation, endeavours to show in one of his last works, "*Zur Geschichte des Dramas*," (Contributions to the History of the Drama. Leipzic: 1854,) that the highest development of the drama can take place only in Romanism. At the head of the dramatists he places the Spaniards, (Calderon.) Shakspeare is highly estimated by him, as by all the Romantics, which school he also follows in the ridiculous assertion that Shakspeare's contemplation of life was at bottom the Roman Catholic one. From a man like Eichendorf we can of course expect that, where his partial stand-point does not blind him, he frequently succeeds in giving graphic sketches. It has created a little surprise that Oscar von Redwitz, the young Roman Catholic poet whose "Amaranth" went, in a few years, through ten editions, and made quite a "furore," does not meet with his approval.

(49.) Romanism in Germany and France has for some time been very productive of works on Christian art. The European Protestants have acknowledged their inferiority in this department, a sincerity which the Catholics are far from imitating with reference to the many sciences where they are not represented at all. Thus two recent works from a strong Roman Catholic stand-point are, notwithstanding their unjust representation of Protestantism, welcomed for their ability in general by the Protestant press. The one, "*Fingerzeige auf dem Gebiete der kirchlichen Kunst*," (Hints in the Province of Ecclesiastical Art,) by A. Reischensperger, an influential leader of the Catholic party in Prussia, treats of the rules to be observed in building, repairing, and arranging churches and other religious edifices. The other, "*Christliche Symbolic*," (Christian Symbolic,) Regensburg, 1854 and 1855, is by Wolfgang Menzel, the well-known author of a "History of Germany" and a work on "German Literature," both of which have also appeared in an English

translation. Menzel is a Protestant, but with Catholic tendencies, which of late seem to have considerably increased. This new work of his promises to explain, in alphabetical order, all Christian emblems contained in the Holy Writ, in dogma and cult, in the legends, in the architecture, sculpture, painting, and poetry of the Church. As Menzel has been for many years the editor of a periodical devoted to art, he is a man of almost unparalleled reading in this department, and cannot fail, therefore, to furnish most ample materials.

(50.) "*Literary and Historical Miscellanies*, by GEORGE BANCROFT." (New-York: Harper & Brothers, 1855; 8vo., pp. 517.) This volume is made up of essays, review articles, translations, and occasional addresses. The earliest paper bears the date of 1818; the latest is the remarkable address on the "Progress of Mankind," delivered before the New-York Historical Society in 1854; so that the volume presents us the opportunity, rare in literature, of studying the development of an individual mind largely endowed by nature, and enriched by liberal and varied cultivation. It is a little remarkable that, in point of style, there is not much change to note between Mr. Bancroft's earliest printed essays and the last volume of his History, unless, indeed, it be a change for the worse. Thus the essay on the "Doctrine of Temperaments," 1824, is freer from rhetorical errors and excesses than any part of the History containing the same number of pages. Another remark suggested by this collection is, that while it clearly manifests Mr. Bancroft's aptitude for general literature and criticism, it shows also that his mind received a bent toward history at a very early period, and that his studies, multifarious as they have been, have all been tributary to this one branch, on his success in which his permanent fame is to rest. Of the substantial merit of the volume, we shall indicate our opinion sufficiently by saying that it has largely increased our estimate of Mr. Bancroft's intellectual power. Although we must dissent from many of its political and philosophical views, we yet commend it to our readers as a collection of writings as well worthy of study, both for form and substance, as any that have been produced on American soil.

(51.) "*A Treatise on the Need of the Methodist Episcopal Church with Respect to her Ministry*, by R. S. FOSTER, D. D." (New-York: 1855; 18mo., pp. 62.) Dr. Foster's first proposition is that the "Church needs a thoroughly-educated and liberally-informed ministry;" the second, that she needs "a more spiritual and consecrated ministry." With positions thus stated no one could find fault; but when Dr. Foster comes to set them forth in detail, he gets upon debatable ground. It is to be regretted that Dr. Foster does not accurately define what he means by a thoroughly-educated ministry. If it be his purpose to advocate an absolute requisition of liberal training (say in college and in the Theological Seminary) from all candidates for the ministry, he has failed signally, and

will always fail in accomplishing it. If, on the other hand, he means simply to assert that the Church should furnish the amplest means of culture for such of her young men as may have the opportunity to make use of them, he will find few to dispute with him. But the whole tenor of his argument seems to imply the former doctrine; and, for this reason, the discourse, though abounding in earnest and urgent appeals, which, if put forth simply with a view to stimulate our candidates and younger ministers to more enlarged and liberal studies, would be signally efficacious and useful, will now, we fear, only excite an opposition, to which his broad and often unguarded statements lay him abundantly open. As a specimen of the force of his style, and of the strength with which he sets forth and illustrates his position, we give the following:—

"II. Our second proposition is, Methodism needs a more spiritual and consecrated ministry.

"Vain were learning without spirituality and consecration. No accomplishments can be substituted for these: nothing will answer in their place, or atone for their want. Though we might preach like angels from heaven, we would be but "sounding brass and a tinkling cymbal." Our polished and literary declamations would fall like moon-beams on glacier mountains, or harmlessly as snow-flakes on the granite. Sharpness of logic, brilliancy of imagination, ornateness of diction, powerful elocution, strength and force of argumentation, with whatever makes up scholastic opulence and faultless discourse, however admired and however needed, alone will be of small value: nay, may be an absolute curse. We want them, but we want them fused; we want them not alone, but in amalgam; not for their splendour as principals, but for their use as instruments. We want them glowing and flaming like the top of Sinai, full of thunders and earthquakes!

"We want prophets of the closet as well as study; men whose hearts glow while their intellects shine: who feel deeply, as well as think profoundly: who experience, as well as theorize: consecrated, as well as ordained: men who walk with God and who are intrusted with his secrets: who go before the Church, and say, 'Follow us as we follow Christ.'

"Such men are they who are the want of the times: men whose hearts and minds quiver with the earnestness of the age, and sympathize with the all-pervading excitement moving the world around them; but who direct all their earnestness, and expend all their excitement, in behalf of souls, and with reference to eternity: who come forth to the people, like Moses from the mount, glowing with inspirations and burning with messages; who, when they speak, cause the people to cover their faces, and say, 'Lo, God hath spoken.'

"A ministry who enjoy religion, and love its ordinances; whose lives, and tempers, and words are unblamable patterns of excellence; whose only ambition is to commend their Master, and transform the world by his exhibition; who live and move among men as ambassadors from heaven, legates of the skies; who love souls, and feel their worth, as the 'travail of the Redeemer;' and who, to save men, count no toil, no effort, no sacrifices too great; who are penetrated with the awfulness of the divine doctrines, and hold and dispense them as a sacred trust for mankind; who feel a burning furnace of love and grace within them, and hear a voice, ever saying unto them, Go, preach! to whom it is a 'woe' if they 'preach not the Gospel;' who weep over the world as their Saviour wept over Jerusalem, and who would die for it, as he did upon Calvary, if they might win it to him; who preach not of envy or strife, or worldly glory, but for a love of souls; not men-pleasers; not careful of their own name; not time-servers; not indolent, or seekers of ease; not mere word-venders or declaimers; not men who mount the pulpit as a profession, or employ it as an engine of ambition; not blusterers or enthusiasts, who give out sound for sense, or vainly expect from inspiration what they should seek

by labour; not empty-hearted and empty-headed pretenders, who run before they are sent to proclaim what they neither feel nor understand; not such—of which the highways and byways are full—but men—men of God—men whose hearts glow with a deathless flame, and whose tongues burn with messages; who stand in their pulpits as watchmen, and thunder in Zion; whose polished and cultivated intellects, full and shining with the truth, skilful and mighty in its exhibition, are moved and impelled by hearts running over with love, and resplendent with holiness; as the prophets, apostles, and the fathers before them; Salem mourns in all her borders, and weeps at all her altars for a ministry like this; and the earth and the world languish for them. How would such a host cause the wilderness to bloom, and the desert to blossom as the rose! How would they carry the truth in triumph through the world, and cover it over with the verdure of a fruitful spring! How would the nations rise up at their coming, and the mountains and the floods sing at their approach! How would infidelity fly before such a ministry, scathed by its lightnings; and error, obduracy, and sin, how would they disappear amid its light, and melt away in its beams! How, under its instruction, and infused with its spirit, would the Church rise up, and shine with the radiance of heaven! How would it penetrate commerce, and impress professions, and affect governments, and send the aliment of a new life through the entire tissues of society! How would it rise above thrones and dynasties, and prejudices stronger and older than these, and rule, and fashion, and sanctify all! Such is its mission and ordination. And what, were the pulpit what it should be, should hinder?

"Is any one about to say, The thing can never be: a ministry of this kind? a ministry so learned, and yet so consecrated; so intellectual, and yet so spiritual; so much culture, and yet so great zeal. Why not? Has history recorded no examples? Have the instances been few of great learning, and yet great devotion? Count up the heroes of the Church, and what do you find? Whence have come the great lights, whose names gleam on the martyrs' page and reformers' roll? Who are they who have braved kings and senates, and who paled not at the stake and wheel? And why not? Is education a foe to religion? Is enlargement of the intellect inimical to devoutness of the heart? Are they who are best capable to understand the truth, and who take in more of its effulgence, less likely to be faithful to it, to love it, and with zeal to propagate it? Surely these things cannot be a necessity. To believe so for a moment would extinguish our lights of hope for the future, and overthrow our faith in the history of the past. The things are not irreconcilable. Light and heat do blend in the same beam; and so wisdom and love animate the same soul, and spread their effulgence and power over the same ministry.

"We must have it: culture and zeal, light and heat, mind and heart! Blended, they will give us power with men and power with God, and we shall prevail. Deprived of them, we shall sink down, down, down in weakness and imbecility, until not a historic vestige will be left of a people who might have been great for God in the earth."—Pp. 54–60.

Dr. Foster thinks vigorously and expresses himself boldly, but not always clearly or accurately; indeed, there are so many verbal and rhetorical errors in the discourse, that we should judge it to have been prepared and carried through the press with undue haste.

(52.) THE opposition to Dr. Foster's views, anticipated above, has speedily shown itself in "*A Defence of the Present Mode of Training Candidates for the Ministry in the Methodist Episcopal Church*, by J. H. PERRY, D. D." (New-York: 1855; 18mo., pp. 71.) The defence takes the form of a review of Dr. Foster's treatise, and criticises it stringently, not only as to its doctrine, but also as to its style. Dr. Perry does not so much dispute Dr. Foster's posi-

tions, as the arguments and statements by which they are supported. The review is very adroitly conducted, and attacks Dr. Foster's vulnerable points with great ingenuity. The following remarks upon the passage from Dr. Foster's sermon quoted above, will give our readers a fair sample of the "Review:"—

> "The second proposition of Dr. Foster's Treatise affirms that '*Methodism needs a more spiritual and consecrated ministry.*'
>
> "If by this proposition it is meant simply to declare as a general principle that the efficiency of the Christian ministry is in proportion to its piety, we very cordially concur in the remark; for we are fully satisfied that the aggressive power of the Church consists now, as it has in every age, in its spirituality and purity. But if an impeachment of the piety of our preachers is intended, as might be inferred from his censure of 'men who mount the pulpit as a profession, or employ it as an engine of ambition,' and 'blusterers or enthusiasts, who give out sound for sense, or vainly expect from inspiration what they should seek by labour,' and 'empty-hearted and empty-headed pretenders who run before they are sent, to proclaim what they neither feel nor understand, of which the highways and byways are full,' then we again take issue with Dr. Foster, and protest against his accusation as baseless and visionary.
>
> "We see not well how this inference can be avoided. He is discoursing upon the need of Methodism; and when he speaks of the highways and byways being full of certain classes of preachers, must we not understand that he means the 'highways and byways' of Methodism? How could it affect the argument to affirm that the world is full of this class of persons? Not at all. But if our Church were filled with them, then indeed would the argument be valid and startling. But we deny the premises, and, of course, dispute the conclusion.
>
> "We admit that a Church may possess all the outward forms of devotion while destitute of vital piety. She may boast a learned ministry and a pompous ritual; the bended knee, the rising incense, and the bleeding victim may be at her altars, while her best services are but 'as sounding brass or a tinkling cymbal' in the ear of God. Still we cannot yet believe that this is the condition of our Church, or that 'she mourns in all her borders and weeps at all her altars' in consequence of her desolation. We have surely no occasion to sit down by the rivers of Babylon and weep when we remember our Zion. On the contrary, in view of the past and the present, we shall be ungrateful indeed if we do not thank God and take courage; and as we contemplate the veiled future, and reconnoitre the yet unconquered territories of our king, vainly do croakers among us proclaim our weakness and inefficiency, and magnify the strength of our enemies. They may oracularly warn us of the strength of the people who dwell in the land, number their walled cities, and tell us of the gigantic sons of Anak, who dwell there, in whose sight we are but as grasshoppers; but perjured and faithless is that son of Wesley whose heart fails him in this crisis. 'If the Lord delight in us, then he will bring us to this land.' Let us, therefore, be strong and bold, walk by the same rules and mind the same things as the fathers of blessed memory did, and, 'with lives hid with Christ in God,' go forward to victory and to triumph.
>
> "With the exception mentioned, we have no word of censure for the sentiments contained in the brief, but fervent and glowing exhortation which Dr. Foster has given us as the discussion of his second proposition. Its rhetoric and grammar are open to exceptions; but, redeemed by its energy and warmth, we hesitate to place it in the crucible of a rigid criticism."—Pp. 45–48.

We think, however, that in his minute verbal criticism Dr. Perry has somewhat overshot the mark; a general statement on this head might have perhaps accomplished his purpose, and would have left no sting behind. Dr. Perry's own style in this "Defence" is not altogether free from inaccuracies.

(53.) We earnestly call the attention of our readers, and especially of Biblical students, to an edition of the New Testament recently published under the title of "*Novum Testamentum Tetraglotton*, edendum curaverunt C. G. G. THEILE ET R. STIER." (Bielefeld: Velhagen & Klasing, 1855; 8vo., pp. 1060.) It contains the Greek text, the Vulgate, the German version of Luther, and the English translation in parallel columns. With regard to the accuracy of the text, the convenience of the volume as to size and shape, and the clearness of the typography, it is by far the best and most commodious edition of the New Testament which has ever appeared. It forms the fifth volume of the "Polyglotten Bibel," by the same editors, which we have repeatedly noticed during its progress, and which has just been completed. We purpose to give an extended review of the whole work at an early period; but must now mention, for the information of our readers, that besides all its other excellences, the work is a marvel of cheapness. The five volumes can be had in paper covers for $12, and in strong binding for $15, of Messrs. Westermann & Co., New-York.

(54.) "*History of the Council of Trent. From the French of* L. F. BUNGENER. Edited from the second London edition, with a summary of the Acts of the Council, by JOHN M'CLINTOCK, D. D." (New-York: Harper & Brothers, 1855; 12mo., pp. 546.) The writer of this work is well known as the author of several brilliant books illustrative of the history of Protestantism in France. Two of these have been translated, and published in this country under the titles of "The Priest and the Huguenot," and "The Preacher and the King;" and their wide popularity sufficiently attests their merit as books for the people. M. Bungener has great dramatic power; his personages live and move before the reader; he distinguishes each with something of Homer's individualizing power. This faculty, combined with the power of seizing upon salient facts, and of grouping them into pictures, is one of the essential qualities for a writer of history; and it is precisely that in which most of the historians, especially of the Church, signally fail. Skeletons of history we have in abundance; it is for men of genius, like our author, to reproduce the life. But the present work, in addition to the merits of style which characterize M. Bungener's other works, has peculiar excellences of its own. He has used his sources carefully and conscientiously; few facts of any importance in the acts and doings of Trent are omitted; few are stated out of their proper and living connexions: none we think are distorted for polemical purposes. The intrigues and the chicanery of the popes and their legates on the one hand, and of the princes and their ambassadors on the other, are laid bare in a masterly manner. The reader gets behind the scenes, and sees all the secret machinery by which the puppet bishops were pulled, unwittingly, this way and that; but nothing is set down in malice. M. Bungener shows himself to be also, to a great extent, master of the controversy between Rome and the Church of God. The reader will find that he not merely states the doctrinal decisions of the Council clearly, but that he shows their general inconsistency with the word of God, and even

with the stream of pure tradition. In this respect, the work has a value to which no other history of the Council can lay claim.

In the present state of the Church and the world, few clergymen can afford to be ignorant of the character and the doctrines of the Church of Rome. Nowhere within small compass can this knowledge be so well obtained as from this single volume. It will also make an excellent text-book for the use of theological students, while its graphic and even entertaining style adapts it to the use of intelligent readers of all classes.

(55.) "*Christian Beneficence; or, the Measure, Manner, Uses, and Misuses of Giving, as prescribed in the New Testament.* By WILLIAM HOSMER." (Auburn: William I. Moses, 1855; 18mo., pp. 219.) Our readers will remember that a prize was offered some time since by the Tract Society of the Methodist Episcopal Church for a small volume on systematic beneficence. Mr. Hosmer commenced this work with a view to meet the call of the Tract Society, but soon found, to use his own language, "that he could not satisfy himself and adhere to the plan marked out by those who offered the prize. He was not willing to confine his work to a single feature of the great duty of beneficence, and hence he did not feel at liberty to present his essay for examination; it was not according to the scheme proposed, and he had no right to tax the committee with labour which they were not appointed to do." After a brief introduction, defining very aptly the terms employed, the work is divided into four chapters, of which the first sets forth the Scriptural standard of beneficence. The lines are drawn here very strongly. The second chapter treats of the method of benevolence, the third of its uses, and the fourth of its abuses; and each of these topics is discussed with force and vigour. We trust that this little work will be widely distributed, and will bear ample fruit in the life of the Church.

(56.) "*The History of Napoleon Bonaparte.* By JOHN S. C. ABBOTT." (New-York: Harper & Brothers, 1855; 2 vols., 8vo.) The mechanical execution of this work leaves nothing to be desired; it is beautifully printed and amply illustrated. We should be glad to use the same unqualified terms of praise with regard to the substance of the work itself; but it is impossible. Mr. Abbott's style is graphic and picturesque. He writes with the ease and fluency of a man inspired by his subject, and the work abounds with brilliant descriptions and striking pictures. The facts of the history are well arranged, and with the construction of the work, considered simply as a narrative, no fault can be found. Mr. Abbott appreciates, far more justly than most of the writers who have written of Napoleon in the English tongue, the true excellences, both moral and intellectual, of that great man, and has amply vindicated his memory from many of the false charges brought against him by previous writers. But he has allowed his enthusiasm so far to prevail over his judgment as to

blind him, to a great extent, to the fearful defects and faults of Napoleon's character, and the book, as a whole, must be pronounced a panegyric rather than a history.

(57.) SYDNEY SMITH abused the Methodists, but that is no reason why Methodists should abuse him. We have read with great amusement and equal instruction "*A Memoir of the Rev. Sydney Smith*, by his daughter, LADY HOLLAND." (New-York: Harper & Brothers, 1855; 2 vols., 12mo.) Sidney Smith was not only the wittiest but one of the wisest men of his age, and the more we know of him the more we admire his great and noble qualities. His life was devoted to the removal of great abuses, and to the exposure of public vices and crimes at a time when vice was enthroned in high places, and when so many perils environed the path of a reformer as to require, in even the mildest innovator, a large stock of humanity and an equal share of courage. Without the power and prestige which in England usually follow high birth or wealth, he exercised a greater influence over the public mind of his day than any man except, perhaps, Lord Brougham. These volumes put his religious character in a far better light than it has ever appeared in before; and although his Christianity partook of the temper of the time and circle in which he moved, and had therefore far less of the evangelical element than could be desired, it is yet clear that his life was mainly regulated by a strong sense of duty, and that he found peace and comfort in his abiding faith in the great truths of religion.

INDEX.

Abbott's Napoleon, noticed.........Page 641
Adams' South Side view of Slavery...... 326
American Methodism, first chapter in history of.............................. 489
——, first preachers from England...... 496
Analogical Reasoning, method and province of................................ 360
Andrews' Discoveries in Chinese....... 324
Aristotle, his political criticism......... 65
——, his political system.................. 71
Australia, history of Methodism in...... 111
——, various colonies of 114

Babylon, both Israel and Judah delivered from.................................. 421
——, predicted overthrow of 426
Bacon, his suggestions for an encyclopedia...................................... 470
Baird's Christian Retrospect and Register. 485
Bailey's Theory of Human Reason 156
Baker's Guide-Book to the Discipline... 481
Baldwin's Party Leaders.................. 139
Bancroft's Miscellanies, noticed......... 638
Baptism, its significance and efficacy... 93
——, its special relation to infants...... 94
——, Neander and Olin's views of 96
——, Rosser on............................ 475
——, Watson's view of.................... 95
Baptized Infants, their relation to the Church.............................. 90, 475
——, what children should be......102, 106
Baskerville's Poetry of Germany........ 137
Baylee on Inspiration...................... 132
Beamish on Antichrist.......... 142
Beecher's Papal Conspiracy............... 630
—— Star Papers............................ 631
Belcher's Religious Denominations...... 474
Bernard of Clairvaux opposes the immaculate conception... 250, 294, 297
Bible, study of, in schools................. 521
Bickersteth's Notes on Scripture........ 325
Biography, difficulties of writing..... . 591
Blaikie's Philosophy of Sectarianism... 626
Boardman, R., his arrival in America... 496
——, his early labours............... 497, 498
Bohn's Libraries............................ 625
Bowen's Virgil, noticed..................... 629
Brewster's More Worlds than One, reviewed...... 356
Brisbane's Bible defended................. 625
Broad Church Party in the Church of England 29
Brown's Dead in Christ, noticed......... 485
Brownson, O. A., his position as a journalist 75
Brownson, his Protestant element..Page 78
—— on Native-Americanism.............. 86
Brühl's Catholic Literature in Germany 476
Bungener's History of the Council of Trent................................... 639

Calvin's Treatise on Relics............... 486
Campbellism examined by Jeter......... 326
Cannibalism among the Feejees......... 128
Captivity of Israel and Judah simultaneous............................ 428
Carson on Biblical Interpretation...... 322
——, his virulent attack on J. Pye Smith 396
Caste system, origin of..................46, 47
Catechism of the Methodist Episcopal Church................................ 141
Celibacy, law of, in France............... 487
Children, (see *baptized* and *baptism.*)
China, Huc's Travels in..................... 615
——, burial customs of..................... 621
——, deceitfulness of the people of...... 617
Chinese disregard of truth................. 620
——, education among the................ 622
—— strange peculiarities of the......... 618
Christianity, its continued existence a miracle................................ 251
——, its field the moral world......... 252
—— in no danger of Materialism...... 253
Chrysostom, Perthes' Life of.............. 135
Church, the, its nature as an organic body............................. 91
Church of England, parties existing in 26, 27
——, agitations in.......................... 162
——, its duty toward baptized children 99
——, its relations to modern philanthropy 272
——, true idea of......................... 460
——, Wesley's idea of 350, 352
Church History, Hase's review of...... 457
——, division of............................ 466
——, modern works on..................... 458
——, true idea of........................... 459
——, true method of........................ 463
Civilta Cattolica on the temporal power of the pope........................ 312
Classical studies, their high place in English schools........................ 513
——, mode of pursuing them in Germany.. 515
Colleges, prayer for......................... 322
Comings on Health 135
Compositions in schools, best mode of teaching......................... 517
Conference powers in the Methodist Episcopal Church.................... 610

Constitution of the United States, origin of..........Page 188
——, early dangers of.......... 198
Cousin on public education in Germany.......... 510
Cousin's Youth of Madame De Longueville.......... 134
Curtis on the Constitution.......... 140, 187
Custine's Russia.......... 132

Democracy, vicious tendency of.......... 60
Dennison's Review of Unitarian views 321
Depravity, general conciousness of.......... 255
Dictionnaire Universel des Sciences des Lettres, reviewed.......... 470
——, its deficiencies.......... 471
Discipline of the Methodist Episcopal Church, South.......... 325
Dunce, origin of the word.......... 579
Durkheimer's Théologie de la Nature... 472

Education in Catholic and Protestant countries compared.......... 410
—— in German and English schools compared.......... 509
—— in England, its moral aims.......... 511
——, practical bias of.......... 513
Elliot's History of the great Secession... 319
Embury, Philip, his conversion.......... 489
——, his first preaching in America... 491
England, school education in.......... 510
——, moral tendency of.......... 520
——, practical character of.......... 527
Episcopacy, Methodist, powers of 603, 609
Esser's Psychologie.......... 162
Evangelical party in the Church of England.......... 27
Ewbank's World a Workshop.......... 325

Feejee Islands, statistics of.......... 128
——, cannibalism in.......... 128
——, Methodist missions in.......... 128
Foster's Methodist ministry, noticed... 638
France, condition of Romanism in.......... 412
French philosophy, modern.......... 156
—— literature, letters on.......... 150, 469
Friendly Islands, statistics of.......... 126
——, Methodist missions in.......... 127
Fry on Fish-Breeding.......... 138

Geology, stages of the earth's formation.......... 366
German theory of History.......... 458
—— Gymnasia and English Public Schools.......... 509
——, general results of.......... 528
Giles' Christian Records.......... 138
Gilfillan's Gallery of Portraits.......... 326
Gillespie's Land Surveying..........
Goerres, his character and writings... 146
Gold diggings of Australia.......... 119
Government, three developments of.......... 44
Greece, political constitution of.......... 52
Gymnasia of Germany compared with English Public Schools.......... 511

Hague's Christianity and Statesmanship.......... 326
Hale's Kansas and Nebraska.......... 135
Hamilton, Alexander, sketch of....Page 199
Hare, Archdeacon, his theological position.......... 29
——, his mission of the Comforter.......... 29
Harper's Gazetteer..........132, 474
—— New Monthly Magazine.......... 145
Hase's Church History, reviewed.......... 457
——, its deficiencies.......... 462
Haven's Young Man Advised.......... 477
Hebrew Commonwealth, form of.......... 51
Hebrews. (See *Jews*.)
Hedding, Bishop, Life and Times of, reviewed.......... 590
——, merits of the work.......... 592
——, his early training.......... 593
——, his conversion.......... 597
——, his early labours.......... 599
——, his services in the General Conference.......... 601
——, his change of views on the Presiding-Elder Question.......... 604
——, his election to the Episcopacy... 606
——, his labours as a bishop.......... 607
——, his relation to the question of slavery.......... 608
——, his decision in Maffitt's case.......... 611
——, his last sufferings and death.......... 612
Hedge's Prose Writers of Germany.......... 481
Hefele's History of the Councils.......... 636
Henry's (Matthew) Miscellaneous works 479
Hilliard's Speeches and Addresses.......... 627
Hippodamus, his political system.......... 62
History as an instrument of education 521
Hodgson on Predestination.......... 327
Hosmer's Christian Beneficence.......... 640
Huc's Journey through the Chinese Empire, noticed.......... 480, 615
——, general character of the work... 615
——, reviewed.......... 614

Immaculate Conception, dogma of.......... 275
——, Biblical argument against.......... 290
——, final decision on.......... 286
——, history of the controversy.......... 280
——, resisted by Bernard of Clairvaux 280
——, traditional argument against.......... 293
——, theological argument against.......... 300
Immigrants, excellent provision for, at Melbourne.......... 116
——, Protestant Irish, into America... 490
Inspiration, J. Pye Smith's view of.......... 395
Ireland, Protestant emigration from, to America.......... 489
Israel, ten tribes of, never lost.......... 419
——, Ezekiel's prophecy with regard to 430
Itinerancy, merits of.......... 347, 600

Jarratt, Devereux, brief sketch of his ministry.......... 502
Jarves' Art Hints.......... 628
Jay, William, his autobiography... 139, 229
—— as a preacher.......... 240
——, his character and ministry... 230, 239
——, his theology.......... 233
——, his defects.......... 245
——, his Mornings with Jesus.......... 327
Jay's Morning and Evening Exercises.. 141
Jephthah's Vow.......... 558
——, Dr. Kitto's interpretation of.......... 560

Jephthah's vow, true view of......Page 563
Johnson's (H. M.) Herodotus............ 144
Johnstone's Israel in the World......... 328
Johnston's Chemistry of Common Life.. 626
John-street Church in New-York, first building of.......................... 494
Jews, political constitution of the...... 49
——, restoration of the..................... 423

Kansas and Nebraska, Hale's........... 135
King, (John,) a pioneer of Methodism in America.......................... 501
Kirwan's Letters to Bishop Hughes... 627
Kitto, (John, D. D.,) brief sketch of... 485
Köppen's World in the Middle Ages... 320

Lamartine's Memoirs of Celebrated Characters.............................. 133
—— History of Turkey..................... 484
Language, facts of history embodied in 573
——, English, historical elements of the 575
Languages, ancient, as an instrument of education...... 515
Lee's Slavery examined.................. 634
Lewis's Six Days of Creation, noticed... 628
Liberal and Evangelical Christianity... 246
(See *Unitarianism.*)
Liguori, Life of.............................. 321
Loomis's Practical Astronomy........... 480
Longfellow's Poets and Poetry of Europe 327
Lovel's Methodist Manual................... 626
Lying severely punished in English schools.................................... 525

Madden's Memoirs of the Countess of Blessington.............................. 479
Maffitt, (John N.,) exercise of discipline in his case............................ 611
Malachi, new translation and exposition of............................... 9, 169
——, canonical authority of............... 12
——, meaning of the name............... 10
——, outline of the prophecy............. 12
Mathematics as an instrument of education.................................. 519
Maurice, (Mr.,) and his writings... 26, 201
——, his exclusion from King's College 38
——, his Platonic realism.................. 206
——, his rationalism........................ 202
——, his style................................ 204
——, his theological essays............... 201
——, his view of eternal punishment 33, 226
——, his view of the atonement... 216, 224
——, his want of orthodoxy............... 32
Maury's Physical Geography of the Sea 477
McCormick's Visit to Sevastopol......... 628
M'Ilvaine's Sermons on the Truth and Life.. 475
Meagher, (T. F.,) relation to Romanism 83
Mercein on the Baptism of Children... 90
—— on Natural Goodness.......... 144, 246
Methodism, its theory of baptism...... 108
——, American, First Chapter in the History of............................... 489
——, demand for higher culture in...... 270
—— in Australia and Polynesia.......... 111
——, its recognition of the laity......... 355
—— rich in biographies..................... 590
——, substantial elements of.............. 346
Methodism, Taylor on, reviewed...Page 329
—— the same now as ever 332
——, its rise on the Hudson river...... 595
Methodist Episcopal Church, history of the great Secession from the...... 319
——, early Church at Pipe Creek......... 494
——, first preaching place in the United States 492
——, first church building................. 493
——, origin of the, in the United States 490
Mission Churches, when to be independent.. 111
Missions, Methodist, in New-Zealand... 124
——, Newcomb's Cyclopedia of......... 324
Monarchy, origin of.......................... 46
Morality apart from religion, value of... 254
——, its natural consequences not moral.. 257
——, its relation to religion............... 261
——, its relation to intellectual development.. 413
——, low state of, in Catholic countries 415
Müller's Geschichte der Americanischen Urreligion......................... 487

Names, origin and history of............. 569
——, geographical............................ 572
Natural Theology, why not cultivated in Catholic countries............... 472
Newcomb's Cyclopedia of Missions...... 324
New South Wales, Methodism in......... 104
Niebuhr's Life and Letters, reviewed... 530
——, his birth and early education...... 531
——, early development of his faculties 533
——, his embassy to Rome................. 553
——, his entrance into public life....... 541
——, his death.................................. 557
——, his lectures on Roman History... 546
——, his mode of studying history...... 570
——, his power of memory................. 538
——, his political career.................... 545
——, his retirement to Bonn.............. 555
——, his visit to England................... 542
Norton on the Genuineness of the Gospels.. 634
Norton's Translation of the Gospels..... 635
Novum Testamentum Tetraglotton...... 639

Odenheimer's Jerusalem.................... 132
Owen on the Unity of the Human Race 167

Palatines of Ireland, their origin......... 489
Pavy, Du Célibat Ecclesiastique, noticed 487
Perrone on the Immaculate Conception 287
Perry's Review of Foster.................... 639
Philadelphia, origin of Methodism in... 495
——, progress of Methodism in, under Boardman and Pillmore...... 497, 499
Pillmore, (Joseph,) his early labours in America 497
Pius IX. a devoted worshipper of Mary. 284
Planets, are they inhabited................ 358
Plato, his political system.................. 68
Plurality of Worlds, Essay on the........ 356
Polynesia, History of Methodism in..... 111
Pope, Temporal Power of the............. 312
Porter's Chart of Life........................ 325
Presiding-Elder Question in the Methodist Episcopal Church 602

Press, Roman Catholic, in the United States.....Page 72
——, influence of the, in the nineteenth century..... 411
Pridham on Romans..... 473
Prime's Travels in Europe and the East 484
Protestantism compared with Romanism as to civilization..... 411

Ravignan's Clement XIII. et Clement XIV., noticed..... 487
Reason and Religion..... 249
Renouvier's Essays on General Criticism 150
Roman Catholic press..... 72
——, its feebleness in Europe..... 72
—— missionaries interfering with Methodists..... 129
—— worship of the Virgin..... 277
—— dogma of the Immaculate Conception..... 275
—— Catholics, coercive power claimed by..... 312
Romanism and Protestantism, their relations to civilization..... 408
——, its effects in Ireland..... 416
——, its death struggles..... 417
——, its literary deficiency..... 476
Rome, Niebuhr's History of..... 548, 550
Rosser on Baptism, noticed..... 475
—— on class-meetings..... 483
—— on experimental religion, noticed 475
Rosser's reply to Howell..... 627
Roussel sur les Nations Catholiques.... 408
Rutherford on Election..... 480

Sacramentarian party in the Church of England..... 27
Sanderson, (Bishop,) new edition of his works..... 486
Sasnett's Progress, noticed..... 632
Sawyer's Organic Christianity..... 148
Schools, English, compared with German Gymnasia..... 509
——, mode of working in..... 512
——, punishments in..... 525
Simon sur le Devoir..... 157
Sixtus IV., his Constitutions..... 282
Slavery among the Romans..... 441
——, agitations in the Methodist Episcopal Church on..... 608
——, civil effects of..... 454
——, modes of manumission from..... 450
——, political perils of..... 452
——, severity of..... 443, 444
Smith, (John Pye,) his Life and Writings 379
——, character of his theology..... 404
——, extent of his learning..... 381
——, his early training..... 380
——, his Scripture Testimony to the Messiah..... 394
——, his Sacrifice and Priesthood of Christ..... 397
——, his studies in Geology..... 398
——, his views of inspiration..... 395
Smith's (Moses) Mental Science..... 476
Smith, (Sydney,) Life of, noticed..... 641

Social Sciences, scientific mode of treating.....Page 42
Socratic system of politics..... 66
Sovereignty, principles of..... 41
Stevens on the Parables..... 136
Stevens's Preaching for the Times..... 632
St. John's Nemesis of Power..... 132
Stockton's Sermons for the People..... 147
Strawbridge, Robert, his first preaching in Maryland..... 494
——, his character and labours..... 495
Squier's Problem Solved..... 323
Sudre on Sovereignty, reviewed..... 41

Taylor's Wesley and Methodism..... 329
——, his misrepresentation of Wesley.. 333
——, his so-called philosophy..... 354
Thornwell's Discourses on Truth..... 323
Tregelles on the printed text of the New Testament..... 486
Trench, Professor, his theological position..... 30
——, his synonymes of the New Testament..... 136
—— on the Study of Words, reviewed 566
Tulloch's Theism..... 631
Tyler's Prayer for Colleges..... 322

Uhlemann's Syriac Grammar..... 626
Unitarianism, its Æsthetic Culture..... 264
——, its religious deficiency..... 266
(See *Liberal Christianity.*)
Unity of the Human Race, Owen on the 167

Vail's Life of Zenas Caldwell..... 482
Van Diemen's Land, progress of Methodism in..... 122
——, people of, their character..... 124
Virgin Mary, origin of the worship of the 276
——, Pagan tendency of the..... 277
——, recent revival of her worship..... 284

Wakeley's Ethics of Funerals..... 482
Wallace's Art, Scenery, and Philosophy in Europe..... 322
Webb, (Captain Thomas,) his first preaching in America..... 491
——, his labours on Long Island..... 492
Wesley, (John,) misrepresentations of his character..... 331
——, his early religious course..... 337
——, his relation to the Moravians... 340
——, his relation to the Established Church..... 349
Wharton on Mental Unsoundness..... 630
Whitefield, his labours in America..... 504
——, his last labours and death..... 507
Wiese, (Dr.,) on English Public Schools 510
Willson's Outlines of History..... 140
Wilson's Treatise on Punctuation..... 625
Words, Geology of..... 567
——, facts embodied in..... 573
——, origin of every-day..... 568

Young, (Rev. R.,) his mission to Australia and Polynesia..... 111

1 4581